



DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol. 111 No. 174

17 April 1987

YOUR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS

International Investment Bank Meets in Moscow 88 1
Briefs: CERN Automation Postponed 88 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Secretary Foreign Ministry News Conference 16 Apr 88 1
Gulita, Shevardnadze Talks 88 1
Atmosphere of U.S.-USSR Talks 88 1
Western Response to Initiatives 88 2
Somalian Libya, Algeria Trip 88 2
No Increase in Radioactivity 88 3
"Top Priority" 9 Apr Reviews Soviet "Spring" 88 3
[Kuznetsov, Yegorov, Flakhten] 88 3
"Top Priority" 12 Apr Reviews European Security 88 4
[Kuznetsov, Yegorov, Flakhten] 88 4
Siberian Briefs Journalists in Moscow on Reform 88 11

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Further Reportage on Gulita Visit to Moscow 8 1
Talks With Shevardnadze (PRASDA 16 Apr) 8 1
World Press on Talks 8 2
Gulita Holds News Conference 8 3
PRASDA on News Conference (16 Apr) 8 3
Timetable Proposed (Kuznetsov) 8 4
DNY Agreement Discussed 8 5
Gulita TV Interview (Boris) 8 6
Gulita Departs 8 13
Reagan, Gulita Comment on Talks, Proposal 8 13
U.S. Media Reaction to Gulita Visit Denied 8 14
Newsday/90 Briefs Part Emphasize on Gulita Talks 8 15
Commentator Views Gorbachev-Gulita Arms Discussions (Belton) 8 15
Paper Examines Security Aspects of Gulita Talks 8 16
[Newspaper is SOUTHERN SUNDAY 16 Apr] 8 16
Gulita Addresses Session of NATO Council 8 18
Moscow Comments (Levin) 8 19
INTERVIEW Report (17 Apr) 8 20

CHINA

Gao Qiqian in Moscow for Political Consultations 8 1
Beijing Departure Remarks 8 1
Welcomed at Airport by Gorbachev 8 1
Consultations Begin 16 Apr 8 1

SOUTH ASIA

Dedichev Attends Jubilee Marking Time With India [PRAVDA 14 Apr]	D 1
Unheraldably Receives Envoy [PRAVDA UKRAINE 11 Apr]	D 1
India Sends Greetings [PRAVDA 13 Apr]	D 2
Army Paper Links Iron Area, Indian Ocean Building [Voenogradov in KHABARKA ZVEZDA 9 Apr]	D 3

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Gorbachev Addresses XXIX Leningrad Congress	R 1
Leaders Attending	R 1
Gorbachev Address	R 1
Turbmen CP CC Promotes, Expels Officials [TÜRKMENISTAN 1986 29 Mar]	R 17
FBI Agency Suspects Another Nuclear Plant Leak	R 19
APF Report	R 19
Foreign Ministry Rejection [Rothburg DPA]	R 19
Further Details	R 19
Explosion Named Chief of Afro-Armen Organization	R 20

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Views Debate on Draft Enterprise Law [Nikitin, Pervanov 6 Apr]	R 1
---	-----

INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT BANK MEETS IN MOSCOW

12061551 Moscow TASS in English 0946 GMT 8 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS -- The Council of the International Investment Bank met for its 43rd session in Moscow on April 7-8 in the presence of the delegations of the bank member countries: Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the German Democratic Republic, the Republic of Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR, Czechoslovakia and also representatives of the CMEA Secretariat and the International Bank for Economic Cooperation.

Officials of the Federal Secretariat for Finance of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia were also present at the session. Representatives of the Afghanistan Bank, Bank of Yemen, Bank of Mozambique, the National Bank of Ethiopia, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Bank of Finland, the Bank for International Settlements, the European Investment Bank and the Nordic Investment Bank attended the session as observers.

The council considered information by the Board of Management on the work to step up the bank's participation in effecting measures stipulated by the comprehensive programs for scientific and technical progress of the CMEA member countries up to the year of 2000, endorsed a report on the bank's activity in 1986 and the bank's balance as of January 1, 1987. It passed decisions on distributing the profits for 1986 and on creating new projects. The council also discussed and made decisions on other issues of the bank's activity.

The session of the International Investment Bank Council was held in an atmosphere of complete mutual understanding and businesslike cooperation.

TAKES

CMEA AUTOMATION PROTOCOL -- The first meeting has been held in Moscow of the leaders of work in the CMEA member states on the second priority line of the integrated program for scientific and technical progress -- complex automation. A protocol has been signed in which tasks have been determined up to the end of the 5-year plan. The solutions to many problems are being reconsidered. Hundreds of names for new technology, equipment, and software are to be created. The problems of accelerating complex automation are being dealt with at 412 enterprises and organizations from the CMEA member states, including 112 Soviet ones. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 11 Apr 87 LD]

Gerasimov Foreign Ministry NP-26 CONFERENCE 14 APR

Shultz, Shevardnadze Talks

LD141253 Moscow TASS in English 1241 GMT 14 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS -- The Soviet-American talks in Moscow are going on in a businesslike, equitable and calm atmosphere of the quest for points of contact and mutual understanding. This was stated at a briefing in the press centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz spent many hours together. For instance, the latest meeting ended yesterday night at 10.30, p.m. Most of the time was devoted to the discussion of the security problem in all its aspects. They touched as well upon other questions. Specifically, they raised humanitarian problems dealing, for example, with the homeless, the unemployed and with the functioning of the embassies.

The ministries set forth the stands of their governments and stated sometimes the similarity of their views. However, on more numerous occasions they stated the difference of opinions on many problems.

It was decided to set up working groups which would discuss concrete problems and fix the stands of the sides before the next meeting of the ministers. These problems include primarily the problem of intermediate-range missiles. Perhaps, this is the most promising direction. Other working groups will be set up to discuss other problems, for instance, that of strategic offensive armaments.

The spokesman of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs said that a rather wide range of questions was being discussed at the talks.

Atmosphere of U.S.-USSR Talks

LD142053 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 14 Apr 87

[Text] The atmosphere at the negotiations here between the American secretary of state, George Shultz, and his Soviet counterpart, Eduard Shevardnadze, is favorable. That was said by the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov in his comment on the talks. Gerasimov said the atmosphere is favorable, but it is too early to give an assessment of the talks which began on Monday and which are focusing mainly on an agreement to eliminate intermediate-range nuclear missiles from Europe.

The American side, which has described the negotiations as businesslike and serious, has likewise refused to assess their progress.

Gerasimov told a news conference that the atmosphere does not cause any concern, it is businesslike and calm. Both sides are looking for common ground. He added that the most promising area of discussion was on medium-range missiles, but this was a preliminary assessment. Gerasimov confirmed that working groups of experts had been set up to discuss the medium-range missiles and strategic arms. So far, there had been an exchange of views. The groups were working in a businesslike manner on a wide range of questions.

The two foreign ministers also discussed embassy security on United States and Soviet territory. Both sides outlined the positions of their respective governments concerning the functioning of the embassies and diplomatic missions in our two countries. The spokesman did not elaborate.

On human rights, Soviet officials, including a deputy foreign minister, Anatoliy Adamishin, met on Tuesday for several hours with an American delegation headed by Richard Schifter, the assistant secretary for human rights. These talks too were characterized as very businesslike. Yuriy Kashlev, the head of the Foreign Ministry's Humanitarian and Cultural Department, confirmed at the news conference that in Vienna last week he had given a list of 139 cases, 350 persons, to the United States ambassador, and this had been favorably resolved.

The Soviet side also took the opportunity to state that human rights were being violated in the United States because of the great number of homeless and unemployed. Kashlev said the Soviet side had expressed concern because while many things are changing here through the Soviet leadership's democratization plans, absolutely nothing is being changed in the United States.

Western Response to Initiatives

LD141406 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT 14 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS -- It is with interest that Moscow is expecting a reaction in the Western countries to the proposals expressed by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his speech in Prague, a briefing was told today by Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

Albeit the first reaction to these proposals was cautiously positive, it has not been clearly expressed. We hope, Gennadiy Gerasimov said, that the process of study of the fresh Soviet proposals will not drag on for too long.

Vorontsov Libya, Algeria Trip

LD141555 Moscow TASS in English 1429 GMT 14 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS -- Yuli Vorontsov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR visited Libya and Algeria on April 8-11 as a special representative of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, a briefing here today was informed by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. His trip was necessitated by the aggravation of the situation in the north African region in connection with the conflict in Chad, he said.

There are those who are trying to use the conflict in Chad for anti-Libyan purposes in order to nullify the gains of the Libyan revolution and undermine the positions of the progressive regime in Tripoli, Gennadiy Gerasimov said. In other words, an attempt is being made to achieve from the south what could not be accomplished from the north when the United States perpetrated a direct aggression against Libya.

The policy of the Western powers is directed at fanning up the Chad crisis in their own political aim and this dangerously destabilizes the situation in that region.

III. 17 Apr 87

CC 3

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

The visit to Tripoli by the special representative of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee who presented a personal message from Mikhail Gorbachev to Mu'ammār al-Qadhafī was an act of solidarity with Libya in connection with the threat to its security. The Soviet Union firmly condemns the hostile actions against Libya and regards imperialist interference in regional conflicts with the aims of whipping up tension around that sovereign country as impermissible.

The exchange of views showed that both our countries are at one in understanding the pressing need of a political solution of the Chadian problem on the basis of the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Chad.

There was a thorough discussion of international and regional problems also at the meeting with President Bendjedid of Algeria. The common conviction was also expressed there that the situation requires vigorous efforts with the aim of settling the Chadian conflict and preventing the use of this conflict to the detriment of Libya's interests by setting African countries at loggerheads, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

No Increase in Radioactivity

LD141421 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT 14 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 14 TASS -- The system of radiometric control stations existing in the Soviet Union is functioning normally. Recently it has not registered any discharge of radioactive substances in the Soviet territory. As statement to this effect has been made at a briefing today by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry. Therefore, he said, answering the question of the correspondent of the newspaper GUARDIAN, if there is an increase in the radioactivity level somewhere, its source is not in the Soviet territory, but in some other place.

"TOP PRIORITY" 9 APR REVIEWS SOVIET 'SPYING'

LD102250 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 9 Apr 87

["Top Priority" program with host Pavel Kuznetsov and Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Flekhanov of the United States of America and Canada Institute -- live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Kuznetsov] How do you do ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to "Top Priority." I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host. Together with me in the studio are my usual panel Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Flekhanov of the Moscow-based institute for USA and Canada studies and in today's issue I would like to take a look at the current uproar involving the so-called Soviet spying against the United States. The Soviet Union has said that the uproar in the United States over a n.w. American Embassy building here was intended to poison the atmosphere before a visit next week by secretary of State George Shultz and I would like one of you to start the program by saying whether you agree with such an assessment [word indistinct].

[Bogdanov] Well you know, before I came to join you about that business you have mentioned, I were [as heard] frankly in two minds; should we at all to touch upon that business or we should just, you know, pass it by as if [it were not in existence at all. But after some thinking over I came to the conclusion that we should spend some time on talking about that.

And do you know why? Because all of a sudden I had all my recollections coming to my mind about what was happening in the Soviet-American relations beginning from for instance the famous or infamous case of Boeing 747.

[Kuznetsov] You mean that there has been a pattern of...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Yes, it was...

[Kuznetsov] [Words indistinct] against the Soviet Union.

[Bogdanov] Yes, yes. It was a pattern of not only adverse publicity but it was a pattern of (?spoiling), provocations. Whenever there was a feeling that there was some improvement in the Soviet-American relations or some capability of improvement, then as a student of the Soviet-American relations I was telling to my friends, including Sergey that look we should wait for something. Wait! Tomorrow or the day after tomorrow something is going to happen in Washington aimed at the Soviet-American relations.

[Plekhanov] At spoiling.

[Bogdanov] At spoiling, of course, at spoiling. And I wonder, still wonder, you know. I have that unsolved question: What is going on within this administration? Who is the boss in this administration? On one hand they demonstrate the willingness to improve; on the other hand they allow such provocations. Because when I say allow, they, they are in that too, very actively taking part on the highest level. And it means again that the forces within the administration working against any improvement in the Soviet-American relations and first of all in the arms control business are powerful enough still to, to blow up, you know, any improvement in the Soviet-American relations. So my point is, we should not look at that as an ordinary space story or whatever you call it. It's a political, you know, conspiracy. Let me put it that way. [passage omitted]

[Kuznetsov] According to the [word indistinct] report by the UPI, American attempts to plant electronic bugs within the new Soviet Embassy complex in 1979 and not only that year but in years that followed, were detailed Thursday in THE WASHINGTON POST by an American architect who helped design the Soviet complex and at this time the Soviet newspaper IZVESTIYA reacted to the news by saying the amazing acoustics provided by the devices would have allowed the FBI and the CIA to hear every sound from a word spoken in the drawing-room to a whisper in the bedroom. How probable are those American attempts to gather information on the Soviet complex and Soviet installations (?there)?

[Bogdanov] What do you mean by that, how probable?

[Unidentified speaker] Yes, a certainty.

[Bogdanov] It is not a probability, it is a certainty. It is a business unfortunately to the usual...

[Unidentified voice, interrupting] It's part of life.

[Bogdanov] Yes, and it's, yes, but there is another problem, you know that, you know. Now you hear from the American a kind of moral indignation, you know about the Soviet behavior and things like that. What you have just quoted, well I leave it to our American listeners to make their own conclusions. But, but, how that, you know, side can express moral indignation after Irangate. [chuckles] Who is you know accusing us? Who is telling us about the moral indignation? You look at this administration from one point of view.

Oliver North is unstable psychologically, unstable person, who was operating within that you know very dangerous framework. And national security assistant to the president, McFarlane who took sleeping pills to suicide himself [as heard]. My point is, it is very unfortunate, I wouldn't like you know to hurt anybody, but I would just like to call our listeners' attention to the fact who was running the show? [passage indistinct]

[Kuznetsov] Yes, I agree with you but what I am interested in is that it took THE WASHINGTON POST about 8 years to report those facts and I mean attempts to buy the Soviet complex, the hilltop complex in Washington, and these kept silent all those years about what they've been doing to the Soviet Union. It is also part of that pattern to accuse the Soviet Union of each and every mortal sin and pretend that they have a clean record.

[Plekhanov] In the first place, I think the story is still very, very fishy concerning those marines in Moscow, and so on. I've read some of the statements by the defense attorney for one of the marines and according to him the statements which were leaked to the press, made to the press, by the investigating authorities, are very, very questionable. There are questions as to whether those statements were not made under duress, whether they reflected the real thoughts and confessions quote unquote of those marines or whether they were prefabricated statements made specifically to implicate, to create, to blow up the story, that is a big, big question. We are dealing with something very, very shadowy and I will not, I mean, go into generalizations concerning what was going on here or there.

But the important thing which I would like to emphasize is that there is a struggle within the Reagan administration — that is very clear. And there are forces very powerful within the administration who are hell-bent on preventing any improvement in Soviet-American relations. They are scared stiff of a possibility of a deal, of an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on INF. The President, I think, does want such a deal but there are people who are doing everything they can to prevent him from carrying it through.

[Bogdanov] Yes, that's my impression too. I share your views, you know. You have a very, very deep division within the administration.

[Kuznetsov] According to the latest reports, President Reagan has said that this uproar, current uproar, is not meant to derail Soviet-American talks on the INF.

[Bogdanov] You know, I agree with...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Was the statement done to wipe the fears...

[Bogdanov] Of course that is a very important question, but you have to deal with the American political realities. The President says one thing but sometimes unfortunately the political reality is very different from what the President says and I again come back to our point at the beginning of our talk that you have to deal with very powerful, anti-disarmament forces within this administration. And whatever the President says, they operate on their own. [passage omitted]

[Kuznetsov] Time is running out on us. I would like each of you to sum up the current situation in this field in a few words.

III. 17 Apr 87

CC 6

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

[Bogdanov] My point is very short and very clear. It is the high time to stop playing with all that. Or we do business or we forget about it. We are in a very unique situation when we can strike a deal. Why we should waste our time on the peripherals, you know.

[Kuznetsov] Information, intelligence gathering, goes on on both sides. When it is played up, when the Soviet aspect of it is played up and the American aspects of the same thing is played down, I think it is not a fair game.

[Plekhanov] I think that these subjects are like murky waters in which one can fish for, with impunity. And whenever that is done, I think that is done for the only purpose of poisoning relations between states.

[Kuznetsov] And your summation?

[Plekhanov] My summation: I hope that this will blow over and that a more realistic and businesslike approach will emerge on the American side. I hope so but I'm not sure it will happen.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you very much. We've come to an end of, I would say, an extra edition of Top Priority from Radio Moscow. Good-bye.

'TOP PRIORITY' 10 APR REVIEWS EUROPEAN SECURITY

LD112113 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 10 Apr 87

["Top Priority" program with host Pavel Kuznetsov and Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Igor Molashenko of the United States of America and Canada Institute -- live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host on "Top Priority." Together with me in the studio are Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Igor Molashenko, both from the Moscow-based Institute for United States and Canada Studies. Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Czechoslovakia, his talks with the nation's leaders and a major speech at a rally in Prague have highlighted the issue of European security which is inseparable from world security. We have been very close to a major breakthrough in this area when we broke down our package of proposals, the Reykjavik package, and agreed to treat the INF question separately. Over the past days the issue seems to have been complicated. What is the general assessment of this situation? Professor Bogdanov, could you give us your [passage indistinct].

[Bogdanov] You mean, you mean the general assessment of the situation with the nuclear weapons, or INF [words indistinct].

[Kuznetsov] I would like, I would like you to treat it in a broader sense: the situation in Europe, conventional... [sentence as heard]

[Bogdanov] You know, I believe first of all that this visit of the Soviet leader to Czechoslovakia is of very great importance.

This is the country today which is facing NATO immediately and which is of course, because of all that, is very much interested in the solution of the nuclear problem in Europe; and I believe it is quite natural that the Soviet leader on the first day of his presence in Czechoslovakia brought to light again the important question of the nuclear war and very closely connected with that the problem of our survival, and what is of great interest to me (?is) polemics with the Western views on the desirability of keeping in stock, if you like, nuclear arms and lack of, really a lack of logic because I would like to remind how the Western European countries and American leaders were claiming everywhere at any corner that they were very much against nuclear weapons and they were criticizing very much the Soviet Union, but now when we come to the real possibility to solve that problem they are claiming that there is no, nothing better than the nuclear arms in the world and they claim that the existence of nuclear weapons is the only reason which kept us from the Third World War for the last 40 years, and... [sentence as heard]

[Kuznetsov] Would you agree with this?

[Bogdanov] No, I would not agree with it because we (?come) if, if we agree with that, then we agree with the vicious circle of the arms race which brought us already to the very unbearable situation when we became hostages of the technological process of human error, if you like, and you have no defense against that.

[Kuznetsov] Europe is important to us, first of all, I think because we live on this continent. The United States is not a European power, and another point is that two world wars originated on the European Continent. In this connection how do we see the problem of conventional weapons and such other issues as chemical and biological weapons because all of them are involved in this European security formula?

[Molashenka] Well, I think that Europe is still in a very precarious position because there is enormous concentration of different types of weapons and not only nuclear weapons which are naturally a focus of our concern right now but also of chemical weapons and so-called conventional weapons. I say so-called because they are so destructive right now that a limited conventional war, so to say, would be absolutely disastrous in Europe and it could trigger the global catastrophe, and it is a very good reason why Europe should be a primary concern for disarmament negotiations right now. And I think it is very important, you know, now there is a real prospect to get rid of at least a whole class of nuclear weapons, maybe not to create a nuclear-free Europe right now in the near future but to eliminate a major class of nuclear weapons, and now we should pay a lot of attention to the problem of stability in conventional armaments because it is not an intention of the Soviet Union to create a disbalance [as heard] on this level. After all, the Soviet Union itself knows much better than anybody else the dangers inherent to the disbalance in conventional weapons and that's why our leadership is ready, is willing to discuss the problem of conventional weapons, immediately or in parallel with the negotiations on nuclear armaments. [Kuznetsov attempts to interrupt, saying "Excuse me"] But there also is a very specific proposal made in Budapest.

[Kuznetsov] Oh yeh, I was about to ask you about this Budapest proposal which was made almost a year ago. What are the main, the main points of that Budapest proposal?

[Molasherko] Well, as a matter of fact it's a proposal for major cuts in troops and conventional weapons on the European territory, and if NATO countries accept this proposal; it means that it's possible to decrease the level of troops for 1 million people.

[Bogdanov] By 25 percent.

[Molashenko] Yes, 25 percent -- it's a great figure, and it would be for the first time. But the problem is that there is no clear response from NATO countries, which are presumably so concerned with the problem of conventional balance in Europe.

[Kuznetsov] The traditional Western approach to the Soviet Union has been that of an invitation to us to set an example or call our bluff. So we've tried many approaches on such issues as, say, British and French nuclear deterrents, I mean whether to count them in the overall East-West balance, or not, on nuclear testing and now on the INF issue. At the same time the, er, more approaches we try the stronger the impression may be with some people that the Western line of getting tough with the Soviets does work.

[Bogdanov] You know I hear that for many, many, many, many times, and I believe that is so, you know naive, and so unexciting but I would like really to stress one point. Such a great country, such a powerful country as the Soviet Union is, it is not an object for a pressure. The problem is who is responsible and who is not responsible in this world, and Pavel, believe me, that if we reach a disarmament, substantial disarmament agreement and if we make substantial steps towards the non-nuclear world I'm quite ready to share, (I you know) the glory for that with America, with anybody else and I believe that we have more serious things to talk about than all this childish, you know, business which, which already sounds very...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] But we ourselves openly admit that we want limits on the arms race to be able to channel our resources into the economy; and this is being presented as a sign of weakness because the Soviets cannot cope with this burden of the arms race forever, so they will buckle down.

[Molashenko] I think it is not a sign of weakness but a sign of wisdom and you know I'm always puzzled by all this conversation about the position of strength, after all, what is a position of strength? For example, the Soviet Union has even now more nuclear warheads on its SS-20 missiles. According to the Western estimates, it has a superiority in shorter-range missiles and still the Soviet Union is willing to sacrifice so to say all these advantages and this position of strength. There is a position of strength on the Soviet side and it is not a sign of weakness but a sign of wisdom, I mean the Soviet willingness to have a major nuclear arms reduction.

[Kuznetsov] The changes in the Soviet Union have generated a debate in the West with opinions being rather split from what I would say is blindness to the depth and the vitality of the changes to claims that it is all window dressing. However, there are a group of people, very serious people, who are, who do believe that we mean business. I'd like to go back to an issue that we raised in our last "Top Priority" which dealt with this spy scandal. A non-binding resolution adopted in the Senate on Thursday urges Secretary of State George Shultz to delay his visit because of what is being said the Soviet penetration of the American Embassy building. At the same time both President Reagan and his chief of staff, Howard Baker, are terribly evasive when pressed by reporters about the scope of American spying on the Soviets and our buildings in America, our property in America. In our last program you said, Professor Bogdanov, that some forces there may be out to derail Soviet-American talks on the INF. Could it be that the stakes are higher than that and that perhaps the whole Soviet policy is, er, they try to compromise the whole Soviet policy?

[Bogdanov] I agree with you, Pavel. There is, in any case try, you know, to compromise the whole policy. [sentence as heard] But that's not the end by itself, you know. You are witnessing, you know, the domestic fight within the United States Administration between administration and the Congress, but at the same time, of course, the main target is the Soviet Union, you know. And they are trying by settling their domestic accounts, you know, to harm the Soviet-American relations to such an extent, if possible, that again there is no point of return and again we are back in our relations for another maybe decade or so. There are bad guys at the Soviet end and there are benign good guys at the American end -- angels!

[Kuznetsov] They never bug anybody, they (I do not) listen to anybody.

[Bogdanov] They never bug anybody, they never listen to anybody.

[Kuznetsov] They don't send spies.

[Bogdanov] They don't send spies, they don't sell arms for, exchange arms for hostages, they don't do anything -- they're angels.

[Molashenko] Yes, and at the same time there was a press conference yesterday in Moscow.

[Bogdanov] Yeh, I was about to raise this issue because in connection with this, President Reagan and Howard Baker, er, saying quite flatly, refused to answer a reporter's questions on the scope of American spying on the Soviet Union and the scope of American penetration of our property and so on and so forth and the reason is that they said they could not and would not comment on United States intelligence efforts. Well how would you... [sentence unfinished]

[Molashenko] Yes, some other people in Moscow yesterday tried to answer some of these questions and the Soviet security experts displayed a number of American equipment, very sophisticated bugging devices which were installed and later found. [passage omitted] So there is a proof of these kinds of activities on American side and it doesn't make a lot of sense for Reagan administration officials to be so evasive.

[Kuznetsov] No, I think it makes a lot of sense to be so evasive because the scope of spying is outrageous in my view.

[Molashenko] Well, yes maybe so if the opposite side can't call your bluff and our experts to some extent can do that. Well, anyway, I think it doesn't make a lot of sense to exchange those accusations and I think that the reason you mentioned, as a matter of fact, it's just another attempt to influence the political atmosphere in a very crucial moment in U.S.-Soviet relations.

[Kuznetsov] Okay, let's go back to the issue of European security which is going to be on the agenda during Secretary of State George Shultz's visit here. According to an administration source in Washington, this is the latest information I got. Secretary of State George Shultz will be under orders from the White House to stiffen the American stand on arms control issues and spurn the Soviet proposal for new limits on underground nuclear tests.

The President went to Los Angeles where his speech to the World Affairs Council has to be seen as an overview about his policy on East-West relations and a preamble to the visit by Secretary Shultz. What is it that they seek to gain from getting tougher and tougher with Moscow?

[Rogdanov] You know, I, I don't know really, but I have a feeling...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] I am asking for a guess, perhaps.

[Rogdanov] My guess is that -- maybe my guess is not very far away from the truth -- but still my guess is that, that usually before they start serious talks they, they really try to raise the stakes, you know, and not only they do it, not only for the tactical reasons, trying to bargain more from us, but they do it for their domestic, for their domestic consumption, to demonstrate to their own political buddies, pals, you know...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Perhaps also to the European allies.

[Rogdanov] To European allies, how tough they are with these Russians, but I believe, you know, again, and I would like to come back to that, that the responsible behavior of nowadays, it's a common sense behavior. We've been wasting a lot of time on all these kind of tactical, you know, tricks, moves, and I am absolutely sure that the Soviet Side, the Soviet Union is beyond that. We are so serious about nuclear disarmament and we believe in nuclear disarmament and we are ready to do whatever is possible. Maybe it's a high time really to become serious and to come down to business. I have a feeling that from the Soviet side, as on many other occasions, the flexibility, the good will, the common sense will be the slogans of the day.

[Kuznetsov] As time is running out on us, I'd like to ask my final question. Would you agree that their tough approach to the USSR could be explained in part by the fact that SDI is likely to become in their view a major trump card, a major means of pressure on the Soviet Union that will make us surrender some of our positions in the long run?

[Molashenko] Well, yes, I think that they put a lot of hope on SDI because there are all these signs of crisis, for example, in American nuclear strategy, crisis in a sense that now it's very obvious for many people that all that attempt to put a lot of political and psychological pressure with the help of nuclear strategy, just, just failed, for many years, for many reasons, but it's a fact. And now the reason you attempt to, you know, to have another technical wonder which will solve all these problems it will create new leverage of political and psychological pressure on the Soviet Union. [sentence as heard] It will create a tool of economic pressure and in this sense, yes, it is a manifestation of this old tough approach to the Soviet Union and at the same time it, it's an attempt to find new means...

[Kuznetsov] Of this approach. I'd like to sum up today's program with the new proposals made by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in Prague. He once again emphasized this country's readiness to seek mutually acceptable agreements on nuclear disarmament, among them 50 percent cuts of strategic offensive arms over the next 5 years and their total elimination in the next decade under condition that the ABM Treaty is observed.

To speed up record on INF, the USSR proposes to start talks on reductions and elimination of shorter-range missiles with a radius between 500 and 1,000 kilometers without linking this issue with medium-range missiles. The elimination of both medium- and shorter-range missiles should be carried out under strict control. Another major proposal by Mikhail Gorbachev is to convene a meeting of foreign ministers of the participants in the European conference on security and cooperation to decide on the beginning of large-scale talks on deep radical cuts in tactical nuclear arms, armed forces and conventional weapons. Deep cuts, you know, they should be carried out under international control and with on-site inspection. In our next program we'll be discussing these problems in greater detail. Thank you, gentlemen, we've come to the end of "Top Priority." I am Pavel Kuznetsov wishing our listeners the best of everything. Goodbye until next time, a week from now on the same wavelength.

DOBRYNIN BRIEFS JOURNALISTS IN MOSCOW ON REFORMS

LD111452 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1317 GMT 11 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow, 11 Apr (TASS) -- Today A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met correspondents of the communist and revolutionary-democratic press accredited in Moscow.

The journalists from nonsocialist countries were briefed on the important directions of the work being conducted in the party and the country to implement the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee as well as the deep restructuring of all aspects of life in Soviet society.

It was stressed that the internal constructive policies of the CPSU also determine our party's policies on international affairs. The restructuring course demonstrates the peace-loving nature of the Soviet Union, which has an interest in favorable international conditions for implementing the program to accelerate its socioeconomic development.

Particular attention was paid in the course of the meeting to the Soviet foreign policy proposals contained in Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's speech at a meeting of Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship in Prague.

The Soviet Union is once again demonstrating its desire to make progress at the disarmament talks. The comprehensive nature of the new Soviet initiatives was stressed. They encompass various aspects of the disarmament process and have been produced taking into account the wishes that were advanced recently in West Europe and the United States, particularly with regard to the medium-range missile talks. The new Soviet proposals open the way to reaching agreement, if the political will -- this is demonstrated by the other side.

A.F. Dobrynin answered many questions from journalists.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON SHULTZ VISIT TO MOSCOW

Talks With Shevardnadze

RU161037 Moscow TASS/RIA Session 16 Apr 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Visit Ends"]

[Text] Talks between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Edward Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz ended here on 15 April.

The thorough, indepth discussion of the central questions of international security and Soviet-U.S. relations, the tone for which was set by Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with George Shultz, facilitated a better understanding of each other's positions and the creation of preconditions for drawing them closer in the future.

In the course of the intensive exchange of views on questions of nuclear and space arms and on other important aspects of reducing and liquidating armaments, the Soviet side worked enterprisingly for translating into reality the big possibilities for drafting agreements opened up by the Soviet foreign policy initiatives.

As a result of talks between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and George Shultz, agreement in principle was reached jointly to step up work to realize the Reykjavik understanding on medium-range missiles.

The Soviet side, in particular, stressed a desire to work out an agreement on the issue within a short time and displayed readiness to solve constructively the operational and tactical missile issue with this aim.

The Soviet leadership made a concrete proposal to the U.S. Administration to elaborate "key provisions" concerning further talks on strategic offensive arms, the regime of the ABM Treaty and nuclear testing, which along with the signing of an INF agreement could form the subject of a summit accord and the basis for drafting legally binding agreements between the USSR and the United States.

The U.S. side has recognized the need for resolving the fundamental security problems, yet proved at the same time to be unprepared to give a constructive response to a number of specific Soviet proposals.

It was agreed that the sides will continue discussions at various levels, including at meetings of foreign ministers as well as at the Geneva talks on security and disarmament with due regard for the exchange of views held in Moscow. In so doing, the common aim was reaffirmed of drawing up meaningful and mutually acceptable agreements.

The sides have evaluated as timely and useful, as a whole, the discussions held of other aspects of world politics and bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations. Thus, in particular, regional problems have been examined in detail and in a frank atmosphere, with special emphasis being laid on those problems that are particularly acute in character and create a serious threat to international peace. In that connection it has been decided to continue the practices of Soviet-U.S. exchanges of views on a broad range of regional issues.

Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz signed an agreement between the USSR and the United States concerning cooperation in the exploration and the use of outer space in peaceful purposes which provides for joint work by Soviet and American scientists in studies of the solar system, space astronomy and astrophysics, earth science, physics of solar-terrestrial ties, space biology, and medicine. There was a productive and enthusiastic comparison of viewpoints on other questions of bilateral cooperation that revealed new possibilities for further developing and enriching it.

The discussion of socio-humanitarian questions proceeded vigorously and was marked by an in-depth presentation of the fundamental approaches of the sides.

The talks passed in an open [otkrytyy] and businesslike atmosphere.

G. Shultz left Moscow the same day.

He was seen off at the airport by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and other officials.

World Press on Talks

OW141405 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1115 GMT 14 Apr 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. The world press is paying a great deal of attention to the talks in Moscow between U.S. State Secretary George Shultz and Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze.

The British newspaper THE GUARDIAN considers these to be the most important talks since the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik. The two sides are discussing a broad spectrum of international problems, but the main interest is caused by the question of disarmament.

Observers seem to agree there is now a realistic opportunity to reach, at long last, important agreement between the Soviet Union and the present Washington administration on the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe. As is known, our country has agreed to remove this problem from the general package of questions of disarmament. We took into consideration the so-called zero option put forward by President Reagan. But a paradoxical situation arose. As soon as we agreed to this proposal, certain Western governments began backing away from it, surrounding it with new reservations and conditions. They began speaking about the problem of tactical missiles.

We are prepared to constructively solve even this question. The Soviet Union has declared that in the event of the signing of an agreement on medium-range missiles, we intend, in agreement with the Governments of the CSSR and the GDR, to withdraw from these countries the tactical missiles that were placed there [razmeshchenny] as a retaliatory measure to the deployment of the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in West Europe.

Moreover, to reach without further delay an agreement on medium-range missiles we have proposed to begin discussing the question of reduction, followed by elimination, of missiles with a radius of 500 to 1,000 kilometers located on the European Continent. This initiative, put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev during his visit to the CSSR, would appear to have removed the last barrier on the path of agreement.

The London weekly THE OBSERVER noted that the Soviet Union has offered one more olive branch. This step, writes THE OBSERVER, should lift all doubts in the West.

In this manner we attempted to create a situation conducive to the talks with Shultz in Moscow. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said about the U.S. Administration. On the eve of the state secretary's visit, another anti-Soviet campaign broke out in Washington, this time in connection with a spy mania. We are being accused of creating a difficult situation for the U.S. diplomats to work in and subjecting them to intensive surveillance.

Such charges are blatantly hypocritical. The U.S. secret services have constantly been engaged in espionage against the Soviet Embassy in Washington and other Soviet establishments in the United States. Therefore, the outrage of the U.S. Administration on the matter of the situation of U.S. diplomats in Moscow -- many of whom, by the way, are engaged in unlawful activities -- is clearly contrived.

Furthermore, the U.S. paper NEWSDAY, in its editorial, admits this is nothing but chatter, dictated by egotistical considerations. The paper notes that there are people who would dearly like to make use of the talks about the security of the embassy as a way to torpedo the talks on arms control. This must not be allowed to happen, since these talks are equally in the U.S. as well as Soviet interests. This is the conclusion reached by NEWSDAY, and it is impossible not to agree with it.

The future dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States depends, to a large extent, on what Shultz brought with him to Moscow. In the opinion of U.S. observers, if during Shultz's visit no agreement is reached, at least in principle, on intermediate-range missiles, the Reagan administration will not have a sufficient basis to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union during its tenure.

Shultz Holds News Conference

LD151418 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1352 GMT 15 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow, 15 Apr (TASS) -- I have spent 3 full and productive days in the Soviet Union. I would like to express my thanks for the hospitality accorded to me here, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz stated. He addressed a news conference today at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center for Soviet and foreign journalists.

On Monday, he said, I met USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. On Tuesday I was received by Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, with whom we held very productive discussions on matters relating to economic cooperation. Then there was a meeting with General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, during which a wide range of issues was discussed, and I think that we have advanced things a little in the right direction. Intensive and interesting discussions took place at all meetings, the U.S. secretary of state said.

PRAVDA on News Conference

PM161315 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Visit Ends"]

[Text] Before leaving G. Shultz held a press conference for Soviet and foreign newsmen at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center.

I had 3 full, productive days in the Soviet Union, he said. I believe that during the meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, having discussed a wide range of issues, we moved things along somewhat in the right direction.

At the meetings with Soviet leaders there were intensive and interesting discussions, the U.S. secretary of state continued. Nearly all the issues were examined, including the problem of arms control, bilateral relations, restructuring, the new thinking, and human rights.

It seems to me that considerable progress was made in the discussion of the problem of medium-range missiles. But the prospect of rather difficult talks lie ahead. One question which is of great significance and is as yet unresolved, but on which, I believe, progress was made, G. Shultz went on, concerns operational and tactical missiles. The U.S. side agrees that it is necessary to impose limits on the number of missiles of this type. And we believe that whatever limits are established, the only acceptable concept is the global concept, since these weapons are very mobile and can be easily moved from place to place.

Concerning the USSR's willingness within a brief and precisely defined period to eliminate its operational and tactical missiles in Europe within the context of an agreement on medium-range missiles, G. Shultz said that the U.S. side cannot give a response to this new Soviet proposal without consulting the allies first. I will commence the consultation process tomorrow in Brussels, he added.

There were frank and intensive talks in the sphere of strategic and space arms, but there was no significant progress at them, the secretary of state said. We accept, he said, the general idea of a 50-percent reduction in strategic armaments and that the verification [kontrol] setup should be very tough. Experience of talks in the area of operational and tactical missiles will be an important guide for considering questions of verification [kontrol] in the strategic arms sphere.

Answering questions on the SDI problem, G. Shultz said: "No particular progress was achieved on this topic." According to him, the United States intends to continue the exchange of opinions with the USSR on banning nuclear tests. The Soviet and U.S. sides made a definite effort in the discussion of chemical weapons. There are good prospects, G. Shultz believes, for the continuation of talks on the creation of centers to reduce the risk of a nuclear war.

The visit was very interesting for me, G. Shultz stressed. Evidently, very important changes are taking place in the Soviet Union. I was glad to obtain first-hand information on this. There are many difficulties in relations between our countries. But we also have an enormous responsibility.

Timetable Proposed

LD151748 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 15 Apr 87

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Igor Surguchev]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State Shultz held a news conference today at the USSR Foreign Ministry's Press Center at which he reported on his meetings and conversations in Moscow. The secretary of state set out the U.S. position on the problems of disarmament, which have already become known from the report on his reception by Comrade Gorbachev.

Concerning the question of medium-range missiles, he said, in part:

[Begin Shultz recording in English fading into translation] I think we made quite a lot of progress and perhaps we can see the prospect of fairly difficult talks ahead, but nevertheless there are prospects for quick progress in this field.

The basic structure of this agreement will be the following: first, the Reykjavik formula -- 100 warheads on each side from the longer-range intermediate forces that will be deployed [razvernuto] by the Soviet side in Asia, and, on the part of the United States, in the United States. We have worked out a timetable for these reductions -- somewhere within a period of 4-5 years. We have resolved that these agreements should contain clauses for very precise verification [kontrol] and inspection [proverka]. [end recording]

[Surguchev] Setting out the U.S. side's position on questions of nuclear disarmament, the secretary of state accompanied it with a whole number of reservations. Concluding the news conference, he said:

[Begin Shultz recording in English fading into translation] It's been a very interesting trip for me. It's quite clear that there's some important changes taking place in the Soviet Union. All the leaders with whom I spoke described them to me, and to others, and I was pleased to hear this information first hand. Our two countries have many difficulties and differences, but we have an immense responsibility, and, of course, our responsibility lies in solving realistically and spontaneously [neposredstvenno] all the difficulties that arise, but, at the same time, we must also remember the importance of constant efforts to achieve more constructive and more stable interrelations between ourselves in the interests of peace throughout the world. [end recording]

INF Agreement Discussed

LD160052 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 15 Apr 87

[Excerpts] The 3-day Soviet-American talks here in Moscow have drawn to a close. The American secretary of state, George Shultz, held talks with the Soviet prime minister, Nikolay Ryzhkov, and the foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze. On Tuesday George Shultz was received in the Kremlin by Mikhail Gorbachev. [passage omitted]

Mikhail Gorbachev expressed a readiness to include into an agreement on medium-range missiles that is being drafted at the moment a Soviet pledge to eliminate tactical missiles in Europe. [passage omitted]

Touching upon this Soviet proposal the secretary of state, Shultz, said this at a news conference:

[Begin Shultz recording] The Soviet side has told us that they intend upon the signing of an INF agreement to take the missiles they now have stationed in the GDR and Czechoslovakia out and destroy them, and that in the negotiations over the remaining missiles they will take the position that the right, equal number should be zero. This is a new proposal and this afternoon they added to it -- zero to be accomplished within a year. We are a member of a strong alliance and on matters of this importance, of course, we don't respond immediately, we consult carefully with our allies and I will start that process tomorrow in Brussels.

But I think in summary I can say that very considerable headway has been made and it should be possible to work out an agreement in this field with hard work and creative effort. [end recording]

At his talks here in Moscow George Shultz insisted on America's right to build tactical missiles and deploy them in Western Europe in numbers equal to those the Soviet Union will hold following the scrapping of tactical missiles removed from Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic. This would lead to a situation where the Soviet Union will be scrapping its tactical missiles unilaterally under an appropriate pledge over, for instance, 1 year, while the United States would be adding such missiles to its potential. This would run counter to the very idea of disarmament.

The talks also dealt with other nuclear disarmament issues, including ways to prevent the militarization of space and observe the ABM Treaty. Addressing the news conference after the completion of the talks the secretary of state assured that work on SDI under way in the United States does not contravene the accord.

[Begin Shultz recording] In the field of space we have not made very much progress. On the other hand we have very strong and forthcoming negotiations taking place. I suppose the one basic idea that is in play is the general notion of a period of nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty. As far as the United States is concerned, President Reagan's view is that the research on strategic defense which we are undertaking is of course being done in accordance with the ABM Treaty and we don't seek to have that treaty changed in any way; we think the research can be conducted in a fully consistent manner with it. [end recording]

Mikhail Gorbachev strongly emphasized the issue of compliance with the ABM Treaty. He did not accept claims that the SDI will not violate that treaty. [passage omitted]

There is a reasonable alternative to militarizing space, (serving) its use for the benefit of all nations. It is indicated by the fact that an agreement was signed on Wednesday on Soviet-American cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

George Shultz handed Mikhail Gorbachev a personal message from President Reagan. The message suggests holding a new summit meeting. Asked how this issue was discussed at the news conference, Mr Shultz answered:

[Begin Shultz recording] The subject was discussed a little bit but, as you can see, our discussion focused on substance rather than on that meeting. I think it's fair to say that both we and the Soviets have the similar view that such a meeting ought to be associated with some important content and that it ought to be a well prepared meeting. And so that is the way we approach it. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Shultz TV Interview

LD152052 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1926 GMT 15 Apr 87

[Interview with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz by political observer Valentin Zorin; time and place not given; Shultz remarks in English with superimposed translation; video shows Shultz and Zorin seated in unidentified room -- recorded]

[Text] [Zorin] Hallo, comrades. I would like to introduce to you Mr George Shultz, secretary of state of the United States of America.

Mr Secretary, these last few days in Moscow you have been having important talks with Soviet leaders. My first question is this: Have the talks you have had these last few days brought any closer important agreements, including -- and I would like to start with this -- an agreement on medium-range missiles?

[Shultz] I think that I can give a clearly affirmative answer here; progress has been achieved. As we contemplated, the greatest progress in the field of arms control was achieved in relation to intermediate nuclear forces or medium-range missiles. I believe that we are sending our participants to the Geneva talks again with greater chances -- probably much greater chances -- of achieving an agreement there in the near future.

We also made certain progress in a number of other fields, too. Of course, we discussed a wide range of questions, from human rights to economic questions, regional conflicts, questions of bilateral relations, problems in the field of espionage that have existed between us of late, and other questions. So we had a broad discussion. Apart from replying to this first question, I would like to tell the Soviet viewers that I am very glad to be here and to talk with your leaders.

President Reagan sent me here on a mission for peace. The United States wants peace in the world. We want to see mutual relations with your great country that are more constructive, more stable and will make a contribution to the cause of peace. That is our objective, and I am sure that this is shared.

[Zorin] Thank you. I think that these wishes will be backed up by real steps, and in connection with this I would like to ask you this question: The latest Soviet proposals on operational and tactical missiles that were made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Prague, and subsequently during the course of your conversations with him in Moscow, and the Soviet Union's commitment to completely eliminate its operational and tactical missiles in Europe in a comparatively short and precisely stipulated period are in response to the apprehensions of those in Washington who recently put forward the idea of a U.S. package. This should significantly ease a solution to the whole problem, wouldn't you say?

[Shultz] This is an interesting proposal, and, of course, the United States is part of an alliance. We have friends in Western Europe and Canada. We have common values with these countries, and we strive together to defend our security. Naturally, when such a proposal, which is new and interesting, is put forward, we consult our allies and do not react to it straightaway. However, I would like to dwell on one point. You have put this proposal in terms of the elimination of these weapons in Europe. We consider that the kinds of weapons we are speaking about are very mobile; they can be transported by air. So the only principle that makes sense is the global principle, because they can be transported, and I think that one of the results of our discussion was the accord reached between us and the Soviet representatives on the fact that the global principle is the correct one.

[Zorin] As became known today, in the course of the conversation with you, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed working out key proposals regarding strategic offensive weapons, ABM, and nuclear tests. Together with the signing of the INF treaty, they could become the subject of agreements at the highest level. I understand that you have to discuss this proposal in Washington and to inform the U.S. President. Nevertheless, if I may ask you to forgive my professional curiosity, I would like to ask what your recommendation to the President will be in connection with these proposals?

[Shultz -- laughing] Well, the answer is easy. I would give the President a recommendation that agrees with his instructions to me. What the President wants is the following: a radical reduction in strategic weapons. He and the general secretary agreed on the 50 percent cut formula. It is difficult to apply this formula. We have already agreed on certain aspects of its application, namely, 6,000 warheads, 1,600 launchers, 1,500 heavy guns [tyazhelye orudiya], the rules for counting bombers and the importance of very strict verification. We consider that there are a number of other areas where it is important to establish what we call sublevels, but we were arguing this issue with the Soviet leadership. We have yet to solve many problems but we should not ignore the fact that we have agreed on a number of issues. We will continue to work on these matters. We brought with us some new proposals concerning space and we are working on this. I think that we will now start energetic activity in Geneva, and try to push forward these talks as soon as possible. We will see at any moment what is the state of these talks. We made some [nemnogo] progress on nuclear tests during our talks when I and the foreign minister exchanged views about the merits of various means of verifying the power of a nuclear test, and we agreed that meetings of experts we were holding should continue. We agreed to instruct our experts to examine the relative advantages of these means of verification and possibly conduct some experiments and try to arrive at some sort of agreement. It would be constructive if they do this.

[Dorin] I am pleased to hear that you are optimistic. In this connection I would like to ask you the following: Speaking in Los Angeles recently, President Reagan stressed verification in connection with the arms reduction problem. In this connection I want to ask you, Mr Secretary, whether the United States is ready for these comprehensive forms of verification that were proposed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Prague last week.

[Shultz] Not only are we ready that we proposed such means of verification. I should say that we went further than a general statement that we want comprehensive and penetrating [pronikayushchiy] means of verification. We described at length and in great detail in our draft on medium-range missiles or on the INF treaty a precise plan of how such verification will work. This is the area where, after achieving general agreement, details are particularly important. We should undertake such work seriously and we are trying to do precisely that.

[Dorin] I want to be frank with you, Mr Secretary of State, and say to you that the Soviet public is forming the impression that Washington is trying surreptitiously, without publicity, to dismantle certain accords on a number of issues achieved in Gorbachev's. In particular this concerns the ABM Treaty. For 15 years Washington administrations, one after another, were satisfied with the interpretation of that treaty. But now some lawyers in your department have set forth the idea of some kind of broad interpretation of that treaty, an interpretation which effectively renders the treaty null and void, if one accepts it.

[Shultz] First of all, in Gorbachev's, unfortunately, no accord was achieved in this important area. Progress was achieved there. However, in the end no accord was reached. One of the reasons for this situation was the fact that the President considered, and I agreed with him, that the Soviet side's proposal regarding restrictions on research were aimed at establishing whether we are able to defend ourselves against ballistic missiles. Of course, we all want this if it is possible, but the proposal by the Soviet side would have restricted research so much that the entire SDI program as a whole would have suffered. We consider that the ABM Treaty satisfies us, and our program has been developed in full accord with this treaty.

You are right that we are studying the treaty very carefully so as to be able to establish, on the basis of this careful study, exactly what the treaty makes provision for. There are certain contentions, points, in this matter. We are working very thoroughly. We intent to fully examine the treaty. It is being studied by our experts, senators, and congressmen, and of course by the President.

[Zorin] I know that the Senate is studying it carefully. I have read the 80-page report by the esteemed expert, Senator Sam Nunn, which asserts that the existing interpretation -- not the so-called broad one -- is the only correct one. The same is said by six former defense secretaries, including Malvin Laird, your colleague from the Nixon administration, who participated in the conclusion of the treaty. All agree that the present interpretation is the correct one, but recently this idea of a broad interpretation has arisen, and this is what worries the Soviet public, and leads to my question. I would like...

[Shultz -- interrupting] Let me interject here and say that, of course, what was drafted at the negotiations is a very important element when we ask ourselves exactly what the Soviet Union agreed to and what we agreed to. We can't help but notice the statement by your then defense minister, Marshal Grechko, who told high-ranking leaders of the Soviet Union -- this is a direct quotation: No clauses of this treaty will prevent us seeking a means to defend our country against these missiles. Perhaps I have quoted him not quite accurately, but the general sense is absolutely exact. He said roughly that. That was his interpretation. We are carefully studying this treaty.

[Zorin] That was an unofficial statement by one figure, a very old statement, which in no form entered the documents, and thus cannot in any way be considered to have judicial force. But I do not want to go into this dispute. We have little time. I want to be sparing with your time, and I would like to broach the question of the Strategic Defense Initiative. A comparison of the way this question stood at Reykjavik and the way it is treated in Washington today, including the idea of the accelerated implementation of the program -- an idea the Pentagon is setting forth -- shows that on this specific question the present Washington position differs from that in Reykjavik.

I would like to ask you about one clear inconsistency in Washington's position. On the one hand, it is said in Washington that SDI is a defense against nuclear arms; but on the other, it is claimed that the growth of nuclear potential, against which you want to defend yourselves with the help of SDI, is a guarantee of preserving peace. A few days ago, Mrs Thatcher, when she was in Moscow, tried to convince us of precisely this view. How can these be combined?

[Shultz] Well, they aren't so incompatible. Now, both our countries rely -- and I am convinced that it will continue to be so in the foreseeable future -- on means of deterrence to defend our countries. Nuclear deterrent forces are the very core of such deterrence. And, fundamentally, such a policy of deterrence works: we have not had a World War III; and we shall pray that we shall not have it in future, either, that there never will be such a war. Nuclear deterrents force both sides to realize that a war would be a catastrophe, a destructive catastrophe; and, therefore, it must be avoided. So, we have means that have produced a result.

The President thinks that, at the same time, we must set ourselves the goal of finding, in some way or other, a way of eliminating nuclear arms. But that's for the future.

It is perfectly obvious that this is linked to what we are able to do with regard to our conventional Armed Forces, what we are able to do with our potential in chemical arms, and the main thing, the most important thing, what we can do to strengthen the feeling of trust and confidence -- trust in relation to one another. It is precisely the lack of such trust that leads to the production of arms, and not the other way around. You said that you want to be frank with me, and I must be frank with you: when you invaded your neighboring country of Afghanistan, and one-third of the people of Afghanistan were forced to leave their country as a result, when bloodshed continues there, we are not in a position to understand that. Afghanistan does not represent any kind of threat for you -- we have had no intentions to set fire to Afghanistan. It is precisely these things that cloud the atmosphere.

There are other things, too. I am sure that some of the things we do cause you dissatisfaction, but it is precisely trust and belief in one another that must be viewed side by side with questions of armaments. I hope that, somehow, we will be able to reach the establishment of such trust. Important changes are going on in the Soviet Union now: I have been told about them. The general secretary and Mr Ryzhkov told me about them. Your writers with whom I met this morning told me. So, let us hope that we shall be able to achieve success in this direction, on a human scale.

[Zorin] I am glad that you admit that you are doing some things we do not like. That is definitely true. As for what you have said about Afghanistan, I must say that Western propaganda says a lot about this. There are many stereotypes here. But now, in the Western press, including the American press, many statements are appearing, saying that the United States is not interested in the Soviet Union withdrawing its forces from Afghanistan, that, on the contrary, the United States is interested in the Soviet Union getting bogged down there. This isn't what I say -- it's what your press is saying.

[Shultz] Just a minute, please. Whatever the press may say about that, let me say that I am the secretary of state, I can speak on behalf of my country, and I can speak knowing the views of the President, knowing the opinions and point of view of our Congress. What we want to see is peace in Afghanistan. We want to see an Afghanistan controlled by the citizens of that country. One of the conditions is the return of the refugees. That is what we want. We don't want to see any continuation of the bloodshed.

[Zorin] I know, Mr Secretary of State, that you are an active opponent of terrorism. In this connection, what do you think of an event that took place recently in Afghanistan -- a peaceful civil airplane was shot down by an American missile and 46 people died? Are you not worried that your anti-aircraft missiles that are already being sold in Oriental bazaars, as it were, could fall into terrorists' hands?

[Shultz] One of the facts of today's reality that is difficult for all of us in what concerns terrorism is the wide and easy availability of fairly destructive weapons, weapons of great destructive power. This is a problem. As regards Afghanistan, you have come into conflict with the people of Afghanistan. The Afghan people want you to leave their country; they do not want your Armed Forces to be in their country. How many soldiers do you keep there -- 120,000. [Shultz continues without translation: "it is a very devastating war, and they do not want you there. They want peace with you, but they do not want you occupying their country."]

[Zorin] I think that stopping the growing flow of weapons to dushmans would be a very good step toward resolving the problem of withdrawing the Soviet troops from Afghanistan and I assure you, Mr Secretary of State, in front of the millions of viewers that are listening to us now that this is a passionate desire of all Soviet people. Now I would like...

[Shultz interrupts] I am glad to hear that this is your desire. Let us hope that the problem will be settled.

[Zorin] I would like now, in connection with what we have been speaking about, to ask a question, though I can imagine the answer you are going to give; still, I will ask you this question. The world press, including the U.S. press, writes a good deal about a serious controversy within the Washington administration in connection with the Soviet-U.S. talks and, specifically, about the difficult situation of Secretary of State George Shultz. Most likely, you are going to deny this, yet, frankly speaking, how are things?

[Shultz] How are things going? The President, members of his administration, and members of Congress wish to establish more constructive, stable, predictable, productive, and peaceful relations with the Soviet Union. We are making great efforts toward this. This is difficult as we do have disagreements. Yet it is very important that we do not give up our efforts, and we are trying to settle our differences. I would like to think that my trip here -- I know that many of the difficulties that have arisen now in our relations -- they thought that such a trip is not a very good idea. [as heard] But the fact itself that I am now here with you shows what great importance the President attaches to it and how important he regards the work with your leaders and with General Secretary Gorbachev, with whom the President has established a good personal relationship. I have a good relationship with my Soviet counterpart, and we should use such human contacts to try to achieve the establishment of better relations. So we spare no efforts for that, and I think that I received full support in coming here for this purpose.

[Zorin] I am pleased to hear this, yet, however, my professional duty calls on me to ask you another sharp question, so to speak. On the eve of your arrival in Moscow, another spy mania campaign was whipped up in the United States, and whipped up so seriously that you had to pose this question in your conversations with Soviet leaders. In this connection I have two short questions for your.

My first question is whether this is just a coincidence or whether it has become a bad habit. And my second question: At the news conferences in Moscow and Washington irrefutable material, proof was put forward of unlawful activity with regard to Soviet institutions and citizens in the United States. Why are U.S. accusations against us totally unsubstantiated and not supported by literally any material proof? Perhaps such proof simply does not exist?

[Shultz] Unfortunately, it does exist. I had a look around the new embassy building that you have now handed over to us. You handed over to us the shell of the building for us to complete the finished work and I was able to see with my own eyes what had been done there. I have also seen photographs of other missions, so there is no doubt that these devices were installed there. As I have already told your leaders we have great respect for the technical possibilities and abilities of your intelligence services. They did a good job, but we cannot tolerate this. Your methods become so suffocating. You are always watching us. You are always trying to get inside. But then the cost of maintaining any embassy here might be so high that it will be impossible to avoid the question: How is this possible? I do not know whether we will accept this building but it demands a vast amount of work.

However, let us return to your main question. Are such events timed specially to coincide with meetings? The reply to this is no. The problems we had last fall arose as a result of your unjustified arrest of the journalist Mr Danilooff. You yourself are a journalist and you should have some sympathy for him. Everything else that was connected with this matter occurred because these things really happened at that time. And the problems that have arisen now are a result of the fact that such problems exist and not because they were specially timed. The very fact that I am here now, the fact that President Reagan went to the Geneva meeting, that he went to Reykjavik, that we sent an invitation to General Secretary Gorbachev to come to the United States, all of this, taken together, seems to me to display our firm aim that is shared by very broad circles in the United States.

We want to establish better relations with you and we consider that if such relations are established then the prospects for universal peace throughout the world will become much better and this is precisely that we want.

[Zorin] Thank you. Of course, it is not for a journalist to enter into a dispute with a secretary of state but I would simply like to say that, all the same, the accusations of unlawful activity made by your side are unsubstantiated. I do not know what you saw, but what we are able to present was seen by all of your journalists. And as far as concerns this strange coincidence, I must say that people in the USSR take account of the fact that the present administration has been taking quite large steps in order to find a solution to difficult problems that exist between our countries -- there was Geneva, there was Reykjavik. Soviet people value this visit of yours highly. It is another matter where we get the impression that there is no unanimity in Washington on this theme and that things are not too easy and not too simple for you, Mr Secretary of State, in Washington. Allow me to conclude our conversation with a question that interests all of us very much.

[Shultz] I would like to interject a comment in connection with what you have said. We have seen, particularly in the period from about January 1984, a gradual improvement in relations. Since then there have been ups and downs but the general tendency remains very positive.

A man called John Matlock has been working during this period in the White House directly with the President. This man knows your country very well. His wife also knows it well. And the President chose precisely him. He recognized his knowledge of your country. He recognized how important it was to have here an ambassador who knows the President well, understands his thoughts and how he thinks, since he worked very closely with him. It is very important that precisely such a man has come here as our ambassador. He moved in here a couple of weeks ago and look at what he has achieved already. He achieved my visit here. We have already begun talks and all of this shows the very strong and positive intentions of the President.

[Zorin] Well, it remains for us to wish success to Ambassador Matlock in his important work. I want to conclude our conversation with a question that worries us [volnuyushchim nas]. Less than 2 years remain for the work of the administration, of which you, Mr Secretary of State, are one of leading figures. What do you consider can be done in Soviet-U.S. relations, for their normalization, to improve the situation in the world, in the remaining period of time?

[Shultz] I think that a great deal can be done. We usually have a tendency to focus our attention on such talks about which we have already talked here. It goes without saying that they are important and we are applying a great deal of effort in that respect and much work to them, and I consider that we can attain accord in at least one of the areas, or even more.

III, 17 Apr 87

A 13

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
UNITED STATES & CANADA

Another matter has an even greater significance: If we strive for this [Shultz heard to say "if we work at that"], if we are able to attain accord in one area and it turns out to be successful, vindicates itself, and if we are able to resolve several problems here and there, we will then form the habit of resolving problems and not creating them. It may be that this will then impart a corresponding impetus to our relations and will give them a push in a positive direction. If President Reagan, with the help that I can give, is able to create this positive impetus, then I will consider this the main contribution, and an extremely important contribution, to the strengthening of peace in the whole world and to the stability of relations between our two countries. You see, both of our countries are great and important [bolshiye i znachitelniye] countries. We live with you in one world where gigantic events take place that have an effect on both our countries. What I would like to do, and what I have already tried somewhat to do at meetings, with both General Secretary Gorbachev and Prime Minister Ryzhkov, is fantasize [pofantazirovat] a bit -- what will our world be like, where are we going, and how can both of our countries, individually and perhaps together, make a positive contribution to this future? That is what we ought to do.

[Zorin] Without fail, together. Permit me to thank you, Mr Secretary of State, for this conversation. All the best to you.

[Shultz] I thank you for the possibility afforded me to speak here.

Shultz Departs

LD151735 Moscow TASS in English 1724 GMT 15 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 15 TASS -- U.S. State Secretary George Shultz left Moscow today. He was staying in the Soviet Union on a business visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

REAGAN, SHULTZ COMMENT ON TALKS, PROPOSAL

LD170712 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0612 GMT 17 Apr 87

[Text] Washington, 17 Apr (TASS) -- Late on Thursday evening President Reagan met Secretary of State George Shultz on his ranch in California, reporting on the outcome of his visit to the USSR and consultations with the Americans' NATO allies in Brussels. Following almost 1 and 1/2 hours of conversation, Reagan and Shultz came out of the ranch house to the journalists waiting for them. The President read a short statement, which said:

I have just received a full account from Secretary of State Shultz on his talks in Moscow and consultations with our allies. He set out our position in Moscow. It is clear to me that this visit was very useful in advancing the dialogue between our countries in a number of areas: human rights, bilateral relations, regional conflicts, and arms reduction.

Important progress was attained in the field of arms reduction. We have reduced the gap between the positions of the two sides on the question of medium-range missiles. Following further consultations with our allies we might propose some new ideas. I remain optimistic regarding the attainment of an agreement this year. There were advances on the issue of nuclear tests and on the issue of a chemical weapons ban. Talks on the reduction of strategic weapons and on defense systems in space were detailed and useful. They are to be accelerated.

When I get back to Washington I will meet the leadership of both parties in Congress and report on the progress that has been made this week. I hope that the current process will continue further and that M.S. Gorbachev and I will be able to sign an historic agreement on East-West relations at a summit meeting. And in this connection I shall personally be holding consultations with our NATO allies on further talks and plans."

When journalists asked Reagan whether the Soviet Union has put NATO into a corner by its latest proposal, the President replied: "I don't think so".

Taking the matter up, Shultz said: "In my opinion we had a very good meeting in Brussels where the whole process was examined, and I think that there are opportunities for us -- and we have different, alternative routes -- they are all very positive."

Shultz noted that the United States and its NATO allies are discussing the latest Soviet proposal on medium-range missiles and "will form an opinion" on this issue. He asserted that it would be wrong to say that there were differences within NATO on this problem. It is correct to say that people are examining an important proposal that has been submitted by the Soviet side while I was in Moscow, and that one shouldn't react to it straightaway."

Reagan was asked whether he has resigned himself to the fact that in the remaining period of his term of office there will not be sufficient time for proper discussion of a new agreement on strategic offensive armaments. Reagan replied: "I haven't completely resigned myself to that. We are approaching this question seriously and we intend to continue to progress along this path."

The President stressed that he "anticipates and is hoping for a summit meeting. But it must be a well-prepared and balanced meeting, where results must be achieved. There must be material agreement to merit such a meeting." Reagan was asked to explain whether this meant that a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting would not be held until some kind of agreement on arms control was prepared. "No, I meant that such a meeting should be well-prepared and there should be prospects at it for reaching material agreements."

U.S. MEDIA REACTION TO SHULTZ VISIT NOTED

LD161016 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 16 Apr 87

[Text] People in the United States have followed with great attention and interest the Moscow visit of U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, as well as his talks with Soviet leaders. Here is our correspondent in New York, Vladimir Gerasichev:

[Gerasichev] Almost all the major American newspapers are publishing accounts by their own correspondents or news agency reports from Moscow. Gorbachev proposes clearing Europe of nuclear missiles -- these are today's headlines and the basic idea of the reports.

There's another particular thing in the 'journalists' accounts: disappointment. Disappointment that, this time too, the American side has turned out not be ready for decisive steps in the area of limiting the arms race. Gorbachev, the influential paper THE WALL STREET JOURNAL stresses, made an unexpected proposal to rid Europe both of medium-range missiles and of operational and tactical missiles. And the United States was taken unawares. Today's NEW YORK TIMES notes that Secretary of State Shultz referred to the need to consult with his allies. But this could have been done before the start of the talks in Moscow.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL recalls that the USSR's advantage in operational and tactical missiles was considered by the Reagan administration to be the main obstacle on the path to attaining an agreement on medium-range missiles. What will the White House say now?

The press is clearly still not ready for such a rapid turn of events at the Soviet-U.S. negotiations table. It is muttering something unintelligible about the Soviet Union's advantage in the area of conventional armaments. But our country's position on that question is well known, too. The Soviet Union is prepared to adopt measures to resolve that problem, too. But it shouldn't be forgotten that, here also, the American side will have to think about how it is going to go its half of the way. The television channel CNN transmitted a direct relay of the Moscow news conference by Secretary of State Shultz.

The list of questions on which agreement was reached during the Moscow talks is impressive. However, the insistence with which the secretary of state repeatedly speaks of the difficulties of finally reaching an agreement on very important questions concerning the limitation of the arms race puts one on guard.

BESSMERTNYKH BRIEFS PACT ENVOYS ON SHULTZ TALKS

LD151655 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT 15 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow April 15 TASS -- The heads of diplomatic missions of Warsaw Treaty member states were invited today to the USSR Foreign Ministry and briefed in detail by deputy minister of foreign affairs Aleksandr Bessmertnykh on the content and results of the talks with the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz that ended today.

Special attention was given to the new Soviet proposals made by Mikhail Gorbachev during his conversation with George Shultz on the entire range of problems of nuclear and space arms and first of all on medium-range missiles in Europe. It was noted that although the course of the talks revealed that the United States Administration was not prepared in practice for an agreement on these issues the Soviet leadership decided to give the Americans and their allies an additional possibility to think over the latest Soviet proposals.

It was noted that the Soviet Union's position at the talks was based on the agreed-upon foreign policy course of the allied countries directed at strengthening universal peace, ensuring its own security and that of the other Warsaw Treaty states, of all countries and peoples in Europe.

COMMENTATOR VIEWS GORBACHEV-SHULTZ ARMS DISCUSSION

LD161722 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 16 Apr 87

[Text] Soviet-American talks have been held in Moscow during the stay here of America's Secretary of State George Shultz. Here is what Radio Moscow's Yuriy Solton writes:

The (?tone) for a detailed and profound discussion of the problems of disarmament and strengthening international security was set by Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with George Shultz. The Soviet leader not simply reaffirmed his sincere desire to solve all those problems in a constructive way, but advanced new proposals offering the chance to make a big step forward in nuclear disarmament already in the next few months.

It has been suggested to eliminate American and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe so that both the Soviet Union and the United States would each have no more than 100 warheads of such missiles outside the continent.

In order to remove the fears of the West about Soviet shorter-range missiles, with a range from 500 to 1,000 km, the Soviet Union gave its consent to put down into an agreement the commitment to fully eliminate them in Europe, and a specific timetable was mentioned, about a year. It was also stated that the Soviet Union was ready to discuss the scrapping of so-called battlefield nuclear weapons. And so the two sides now seem to be closer to agreement on medium-range missiles in linkage with tactical missiles.

But the talks also showed something else -- that the U.S. Administration is so far practically unprepared for agreement. And that applies to the above mentioned problem, and to the problem of strategic and space weapons.

Mikhail Gorbachev has described as logic the other way round [as heard] the attempts made by the NATO countries already after the Moscow talks to respond to the new Soviet initiative, not by agreeing to bring down the level of nuclear weapons in Europe to zero, but by rearming themselves.

At the Moscow talks, the United States demonstrated the intention to again complicate the solution of the problem of strategic arms by confusing technical details, and that can be described as nothing else but departure from the Reykjavik general agreement. The same can be said about America's intention to reduce the earlier agreed period of not overstepping the Antiballistic Missile Treaty from 10 to 7 years.

The Soviet Union has suggested working out key provisions concerning strategic offensive weapons, anti-ballistic missiles and also nuclear tests. Along with signing a treaty on medium-range missiles, those provisions could be a subject of a top-level agreement and the basis for preparing legally binding agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Cautious optimism, such was the first reaction on the outcome of the Moscow talks, and one can quite agree with such an assessment. The Soviet Union has again given the West a chance to start practical disarmament and not only speak about the need to lessen the military danger. But will the United States and its NATO allies take advantage of that chance?

PAPER EXAMINES SECURITY ASPECTS OF SHULTZ TALKS

PM161331 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Apr 87 First Edition p 5

[A. Mozgovoy article: "M.S. Gorbachev: Is It Time to Restructure Soviet-U.S. Relations?" -- first paragraph printed in boldface italics; passages within slantlines published in boldface]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz has been on a business visit to Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Government. N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, had talks with him. The head of the U.S. State Department was received by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 14 April. A frank and principled conversation took place, marked by the desire to seriously seek solutions to key questions of international security.

Over the last 2 years our country has taken a number of steps in order to create a new atmosphere in relations between the USSR and the United States. These steps offered prospects for mutual understanding and accord. Not a single previous U.S. Administration had been offered such chances. But the United States failed to display the will to take advantage of them in order to improve bilateral relations and the international situation. This is precisely why, during the conversation with G. Shultz, M.S. Gorbachev directly asked the head of the U.S. State Department: Is the administration prepared to really do something in the remaining time?

This applies primarily to the problem of nuclear disarmament. A chance has emerged now to reach accord on medium-range missiles. Our country's proposals on this account are well known. "Our proposals on medium-range missiles," M.S. Gorbachev noted in the conversation with G. Shultz, "represent an attempt to create, both for the administration and for ourselves, the best conditions to take a major step, maybe the most difficult step, but a step that would mark the beginning of a real process of terminating the nuclear arms race and reducing nuclear weapons."

A paradoxical situation developed after the USSR submitted its proposals on medium-range missiles, which take into account wishes previously expressed by NATO leaders: Some Western politicians and even governments are now disowning their own "zero option" as if it were an impure force and are trying to make the resolution of the medium-range missiles question subject to all sorts of conditions and reservations. In particular, they artificially exaggerate the problem of operational and tactical missiles in terms of which, North Atlantic bloc figures claim, the Soviet Union enjoys "superiority" in Europe.

But operational and tactical missiles cannot be taken in isolation from other nuclear weapon delivery vehicles. The United States and its NATO allies have a vast potential of such vehicles in the Old World. The following facts testify to this: /The United States has deployed 640 nuclear-armed aircraft in West Europe. Aircraft carriers of the U.S. Navy's 6th and 2d fleets, cruising in European waters, carry about 300 nuclear-armed ground attack aircraft. The North Atlantic bloc has a total of up to 4,000 nuclear weapon delivery vehicles in West Europe./

In other words, the "dramatic imbalance" in reduced range means, about which so much noise is made in the West, simply does not exist. The USSR is in no way aiming to retain them. On the contrary, it is doing everything to reduce their numbers and, in the long term, to fully eliminate them. For example, it was proposed at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik to freeze the number of missiles with a range of less than 1,000 km and right away start talks on their future.

Literally a few days ago -- during his visit to Czechoslovakia -- M.S. Gorbachev announced the USSR's readiness to start discussing the question of reducing and subsequently eliminating missiles with a range of 500-1,000 km stationed in the continent of Europe, without linking this with the course and outcome of the solution of the medium-range missiles problem. Moreover, the sides would pledge that they would not build up the number of operational and tactical missiles during the period of talks. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee confirmed yet again at the Prague rally that, following the signing of an agreement on medium-range missiles and regardless of the course of discussions on the question of operational and tactical missiles, the Soviet Union, in agreement with the CSSR and GDR Governments, would withdraw from these countries the missiles stationed there as countermeasures to the deployment of U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in West Europe. The implementation of any accord on medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles would, of course, take place under strict verification.

And so, in the course of the conversation with G. Shultz, M.S. Gorbachev announced a new major step by the USSR -- he expressed readiness /to include in the medium-range missiles agreement a pledge by the Soviet Union to completely eliminate its operational and tactical missiles in Europe within a relatively brief and precisely defined time period./ The response by the U.S. secretary of state made it clear that the U.S. Administration, together with its NATO allies, has no intention of descending to zero level in the sphere of operational and tactical missiles.

Questions of strategic nuclear arms and the White House's "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) were discussed in detail during the conversation in the Kremlin. It was noted that retreats from the Reykjavik positions are noticeable on the U.S. side. M.S. Gorbachev stressed that if the United States were to deploy a space-based ABM defense system, there would be no agreement at all on strategic offensive arms. But bearing in mind that the administration has committed itself to SDI, our country -- in its quest for a solution and in order not to thwart the process of talks on nuclear disarmament -- is prepared to seek a way out in this sphere, too. We agree to research in the sphere of ABM defense, provided it is confined to the framework of the laboratory. Moreover, it was explained to G. Shultz how the Soviet Union interprets this. Namely: research work on earth -- in institutes, at test sites, and in plants.

M.S. Gorbachev offered the elaboration of "key provisions" regarding strategic offensive weapons, ABM defense, and nuclear tests. Together with the signing of a treaty on medium-range missiles, they could become /the subject of accord at summit level/ and provide a basis on which to prepare legally binding agreements between the USSR and the United States. "In order to agree to these 'key provisions' and conclude a treaty on medium-range missiles," M.S. Gorbachev declared, "I am prepared to meet the President of the United States."

There was a brief discussion of the "human rights" subject, the latest outburst of spy mania in the United States, and the question of regional conflicts during the conversation.

M.S. Gorbachev emphasized at the conclusion of the meeting: "We have no intention of pursuing a pugnacious policy toward the United States. We reject the flawed principle according to which the better things are for the Soviet Union the worse they will be for the United States, and vice versa. Old stereotypes ought to be left behind. Our two countries bear too great a responsibility to the world.... We invite the United States to reflect that it is time to restructure Soviet-U.S. relations and to ponder how to live in the future, how to assist in improving the entire international situation. I am convinced that this can and must be done."

This same belief and confidence are shared by all Soviet people.

SHULTZ ADDRESSES SESSION OF NATO COUNCIL

LD161938 Moscow TASS in English 1913 GMT 16 Apr 87

[Text] Brussels April 16 TASS -- A special session of the NATO Council on the level of foreign ministers was held here today. At the session U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz informed West European allies of the United States by the NATO bloc of the results of his talks in Moscow on disarmament problems.

Upon the end of the session Shultz spoke at a press conference at which he positively assessed, on the whole, the results of the talks in the USSR and pointed out that a significant progress had been made there. He said that a prospect existed today on concluding a good agreement on intermediate-range missiles in Europe. There are all the basic elements of the future agreement, and it remains for the NATO countries to take a decision concerning their stand. According to Shultz, the allies realize their great responsibility for taking a correct decision. In his turn, NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington emphasized that the visit of the U.S. Secretary of State to Moscow had brought closer prospects of reaching agreement on intermediate-range missiles.

Moscow Comments

LD162304 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 15 Apr 87

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Viktor Levin]

[Excerpts] Let us proceed now to the problems of nuclear arms limitation and the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. You know that in the course of the conversations of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders with U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, new proposals were voiced that give form to the ideas expressed by the Soviet leader last year in Prague and go even further.

I will remind you that in the conversation with Shultz, the readiness of the Soviet Union for the elimination of not only medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles, but also battle tactical missiles was stated.

During the conversation Shultz did not give any concrete answer. Today, as a telegram from Brussels reports, he familiarized the leaders of the foreign policy departments of the NATO states with the content of the Moscow talks. As the telegram of DPA NEWS AGENCY notes, satisfaction over the prospects for working out an agreement on medium-range missiles was expressed at the meeting. However, one cannot overlook the fact that, judging again by the DPA telegram, more emphasis was laid by the NATO ministers on attempting to justify their persistent unwillingness to lead the matter toward a nuclear-free Europe and not on the problem of INF.

At the meeting in Brussels the view was expressed that it is necessary to retain in Europe nuclear weapons described as a necessary component of the NATO strategy of nuclear deterrence. It is noteworthy that at the same time -- Lord Carrington, the NATO general secretary, spoke about this in part -- attempts are again being undertaken to represent the matter as if nuclear weapons are necessary for NATO to order to counter, as the NATO leaders assert, the superiority of the Warsaw Pact countries in conventional armed forces and weapons. Since this thesis is being used very frequently of late it will be expedient, in my view, to dwell on the problem of correlation of forces in greater detail. [passage omitted]

I will name a few figures. They speak very well for themselves. NATO has 94 combat-ready divisions in Europe, while the Warsaw Pact has 78. What is more, it is necessary to take into account that the numbers of the divisions of the armies of the Warsaw Pact countries is between half and two-thirds those of the divisions of the NATO countries. Here is another correlation of forces in the field of tactical air force: In the area of combat aircraft the correlation is 1.2 to 1, while in the area of helicopters, 1.8 to 1, with the superiority being on the side of NATO.

True, taking into account that we indeed have more tanks, although with Spain entering NATO, this superiority has been considerably reduced, and there are also other equalizing points, we believe that all in all there is parity. Our superiority is simply out of the question. The conclusion is apparent: Those who are intensely whipping up the myth of Soviet superiority today are also trying willingly or unwillingly — and in my view, rather willingly — to poison the atmosphere of Soviet-U.S. talks and to hinder the development [vyrabotka] of agreements that would open up the way toward the limitation of nuclear weapons.

Leaving Moscow Shultz said that the United States should thoroughly think over the new Soviet proposals. This is natural, but it would be sad if this thinking over hides a search for ways to evade the agreement.

IZVESTIYA Report

PM170905 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Apr 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Consultations With Allies"]

[Text] Brussels, 16 Apr — U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz has informed representatives of the NATO countries of the results of his talks with the Soviet leadership in Moscow 13 through 15 April this year. He addressed a session of the NATO Council at foreign minister level specially convened for the purpose.

At the close of the session G. Shultz addressed a news conference during which he gave as a whole a positive assessment of the results of his talks in Moscow, noting that substantial progress was achieved there. "We now have the prospect of a good agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe. All the basic elements exist for a future agreement. And now we have to take a decision concerning our position — should it be changed for decreased range missiles [rakety ponizhennoy dalnosti]? We are approaching this decision cautiously and on the basis of consultations."

G. Shultz said that at the session he made a thorough and full report on the talks he had in Moscow after which "there was a study of alternatives and the process of preparing our decision was begun." Noting that the Soviet side had made a new proposal, G. Shultz said that he could not reply to it without a preliminary consultation with the NATO allies. According to him, the allies are aware of the great responsibility that rests with them for making the correct decision and they intend to discuss everything painstakingly and only then make a decision. "We do not intend to be in a hurry with any unconsidered conclusions... We have a difficult decision to make," he added, recognizing that he could not say when this decision could be expected.

At the same time the leader of the U.S. diplomatic department insisted on the need to preserve NATO's "flexible response" doctrine, which provides for the use of nuclear weapons in the event of a military conflict. He said that this strategy "will be retained irrespective of the decision NATO makes on medium-range missiles or operational and tactical missiles."

For his part NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington made a statement in which he stressed that G. Shultz' visit to Moscow "has demonstrated further headway on important aspects of arms control and has brought closer the prospects of reaching an agreement on medium-range missiles." Lord Carrington stressed that the allies "will begin immediately a discussion of the consequences of these proposals for NATO's security."

QIAN QICHEN IN MOSCOW FOR POLITICAL CONSULTATIONS

Beijing Departure Remarks

OW131954 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1500 GMT 13 Apr 87

[Text] Routine consultations between the Soviet and the Chinese Governments will begin in Moscow on Tuesday 14 April.

Talking to reporters at Beijing Airport before his departure for Moscow, Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, special envoy of the Chinese Government, said that a dialogue would be conducted in earnest to discuss questions concerning the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations. He hoped that progress would be made in the consultations.

Welcomed at Airport by Rogachev

LD131352 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 13 Apr 87

[Text] Moscow, 13 Apr (TASS) -- Today Qian Qichen, special representative of the Chinese Government and PRC vice minister of foreign affairs, arrived in Moscow with a group of advisers and experts for the holding of Soviet-Chinese political consultations.

At the airport he was met by Igor Rogachev, the special representative of the Soviet Government and USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, and other officials. Among the welcoming party was Li Zewang, PRC ambassador to the USSR.

The latest round of Soviet-Chinese political consultations will begin on 14 April.

Consultations Begin 14 Apr

OW150059 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 14 Apr 87

[Text] The 10th round of Soviet-Chinese political consultations began today in Moscow. The current round is being held at the deputy foreign minister level, as were the previous ones. Pyadyshev, official spokesman of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, told this to our reporter. The two sides, he noted, will continue to discuss the question of normalizing their bilateral relations. For example, they will exchange views on developing and strengthening their ties in the political, economic, trade, and other fields and on certain important international and regional issues.

Soviet-Chinese political consultations were instituted 5 years ago. They are held twice a year in the capitals of the two countries in turn. These consultations, Pyadyshev stressed, show that Soviet-Chinese relations are developing in a sound, normal manner.

DEMICHEV ATTENDS JUBILEE MARKING TIES WITH INDIA

PM150951 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Apr 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Weighty Peace Factor"]

[Text] The participants in a ceremonial meeting devoted to the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and India held in Moscow on 13 April described Soviet-Indian friendship and cooperation as a weighty factor in world politics helping to maintain and strengthen peace and the peoples' security.

The meeting's presidium comprised P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, leaders of a number of ministries and departments, and representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations.

The report delivered by USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yu.M. Vorontsov and the speeches cited specific examples confirming the stability of the ongoing development of Soviet-Indian relations sealed by the Treaty on Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation. It was noted that the exchange of high-level visits in 1985-1986, meetings and talks between the leaders of the two countries, and the qualitatively new level of USSR-Indian ties occupy a special place.

Speakers expressed the hope that the holding of the Festival of India in the USSR and the Festival of the Soviet Union in India will demonstrate that Soviet-Indian friendship remains a powerful argument for reason, humanism, and peace.

T.N. Kaul, Indian ambassador to the USSR, took part in the meeting.

Shcherbitskiy Receives Envoy

AU151001 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 11 Apr 87 p 1

[RATAU report: "A Conversation in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] On 10 April, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, received Triloki Nath Kaul, ambassador of the Republic of India to the USSR, at the latter's request. The ambassador arrived in Kiev to participate in events taking place in the Ukrainian SSR on the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and India.

During a conversation the steadily developing cooperation between the two countries was noted. It was emphasized that the Soviet-India summit meeting held in Delhi in November 1986 introduced qualitatively new lines to cooperation between the USSR and the Republic of India. The Delhi declaration on the principles of a world free from nuclear weapons and violence, signed by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and R. Gandhi, prime minister, was a document with new political thought.

T.N. Kruel expressed confidence that Indian-Soviet friendship and cooperation, which have become an important factor in guaranteeing stability in Asia and all over the world, would continue to develop and strengthen in the interests of our countries and peoples, in the interests of peace and international security. The ambassador pointed out that, through its proposals aimed at reducing nuclear weapons, the USSR had contributed a real part in the cause of attenuating the threat of war.

V.V. Shcherbitskiy highly appraised the contribution made by India, one of the leaders of the Nonaligned Movement, toward the cause of preserving and consolidating general peace and curbing the arms race. He gave an account of the socioeconomic development of the republic, of the progress made in implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee January 1987 Plenum, and of the part of the Ukrainian SSR in Soviet-Indian economic, scientific-technological, and cultural cooperation.

The conversation was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere, and was attended by A.V. Merkulov, department chief of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, and L.N. Piparsania [spelling as published], consul general of the Republic of India in the city of Odessa.

India Sends Greetings

PM141443 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Apr 87 Second Edition p 1

[Greetings message to USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman Gromyko and USSR Council of Ministers Chairman Ryzhkov from Indian President Singh and Indian Prime Minister Gandhi on the 40th anniversary of establishment of diplomatic relations]

[Text] To His Excellency Mr Andrey A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

To His Excellency Mr Nikolay I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

Your Excellencies,

The 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between India and the USSR is an important landmark in our bilateral relations.

These years have been marked by an impressive development of mutually useful and wide-ranging cooperation between our two countries, attesting to the invariable warmth and vitality of our relations. The Indian-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation serves as a positive and stabilizing factor of peace not only in the region but on a broad international level. The November 1986 Delhi Declaration has boosted to new heights our collaboration for the sake of peace. It is extremely noteworthy that we are starting a Festival of India in the USSR and a USSR Festival in India in this jubilee year. There is no doubt that the blooms of these festivals will bear fruit in the future.

On this happy occasion we send warm greetings and best wishes for prosperity and well-being to the friendly Soviet people, and for good health to you personally.

Zail Singh, president of India

Rajiv Gandhi, prime minister of India

ARMY PAPER LINKS IRAN ARMS, INDIAN OCEAN BUILDUP

PM141503 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Apr 87 First Edition p 3

["Military-Political Commentary" by V. Vinogradov: "With Both the Left and the Right Hand"]

[Text] Once again the Washington administration has been caught red-handed. The illegal deliveries of combat hardware and military equipment to Iran continue despite the sworn assurances to the contrary of its leading representatives. According to a report by the NBC TV network quoting U.S. and foreign intelligence sources, as recently as the first half of last month the United States dispatched to Iran a consignment of electronic equipment for antiaircraft defense fire control. According to the television network, a "communications channel established back in the summer of last year between the U.S. National Security Council and Iranian representatives" and kept "open" by the CIA since then was used for the deliveries. Some of the equipment, NBC reported, was marked as "spare parts for cars." Via an airport in Belgium it was flown to Pakistan and from there on Pakistani civilian and military aircraft to Iran.

So this is what Washington's "left hand" is doing, so to speak. And what is its "right hand" up to? According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, Pentagon chief Weinberger has ordered the U.S. Navy to step up its activity in the Persian Gulf and its approaches. In accordance with his instructions, the aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk is to continue patrolling the northwest part of the Indian Ocean through the end of May -- almost 3 months longer than originally planned. Then, from the beginning of June, a U.S. Navy carrier formation consisting of 6-8 vessels is to be permanently deployed in that area. At the same time the Navy command is also earnestly considering plans to deploy in the Indian Ocean task forces headed by recently modernized battleships which, as is known, are equipped with Tomahawk nuclear-armed cruise missiles.

What has prompted the Pentagon to make this decision? According to Sims, U.S. assistant secretary of defense, this decision was made "in connection with the worsened situation in the Persian Gulf and the need to ensure the safety of shipping." Furthermore, in his words the aircraft carriers, battleships, and other warships will patrol the coast of the northwest part of the Indian Ocean and will be in a state of constant readiness to open fire "if this becomes necessary." Incidentally, it has been reported that all five ships of the U.S. Near East Command deployed in the Persian Gulf have already been placed in this state of readiness. Under the selfsame pretext of "ensuring the freedom of shipping."

The end result is as follows: On the one hand the United States secretly continues to supply arms to Iran, thus aggravating and protracting the Iran-Iraq conflict, which threatens the entire Persian Gulf region; and on the other hand, in connection with the resulting situation, it is building up its impressive military presence there, which equally sharply exacerbates the atmosphere in the area. Thus, contradicting the well known saying, Washington's right hand is clearly aware of what its left hand is doing. With both hands, Washington is intensifying the tension in the Persian Gulf by preparing the ground for possible U.S. armed intervention. This is by no means in keeping with the fundamental interests of the peoples inhabiting the area.

GORBACHEV ADDRESSES 20TH KOMSOMOL CONGRESS

Leaders Attending

LD161704 Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0457 GMT on 16 April, in its live relay of the 20th Komsomol congress in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow, shows Soviet leaders taking the stage, preceded by Komsomol First Secretary Viktor Mironenko. Gorbachev leads, followed by Gromyko, Ryzhkov, Ligachev, and Zaykov. The television shows the following leadership line-up on the platform; left to right on the screen:

Front row: Zaykov, Chebrikov, Ligachev, Gromyko, Gorbachev, Mironenko, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Shcherbitskiy, Shevardnadze, Vorotnikov, Aliyev; Second row: Demichev, Dolgikh, Yeltsin, Sokolov, Talyzin, Solovyev, Yakovlev, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Medvedev, Razumovskiy, Nikonov, Lukyanov, Kapitonov, Murakhovskiy. Also appearing on the platform are AUCCTU leader Shatalov, Cosmonaut Savitskaya, and Deputy Chairmen of the Council of Ministers Shcherbina, Kamentsev, Gusev, Vedernikov, Silayev, Antonov, and Batalin.]

Gorbachev Address

LD160846 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0531 GMT 16 Apr 87

[Address by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 20th Komsomol Congress in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses -- live]

[Text] Dear comrades, Komsomol members, the 20th Congress of the Leninist Komsomol, an organization with which the fighting and labor youth of almost every Soviet person is linked, an organization which has given all of us a start into the new socialist life, is in its 2d day of work.

I have probably never had such a tremendous wish to take part in a discussion as I have today, at the present Komsomol congress. I know that my comrades in the party Central Committee and in the government feel the same.

I think that everything is understandable here: Present in the hall are those who represent both the today and the tomorrow of our country of the Soviets. Perhaps what is being said here today has great meaning not only for the present days -- remarkable though they are -- but also for future days.

There are no indifferent people here today, and there can't be, for everyone feels -- and one cannot but feel it -- your revived Komsomol fervour, fighting spirit, your solicitous concern for the present, and your future-mindedness. Your mood is transmitted to us. We are becoming young again with you at the present time. [applause]

The Communist Party and I believe our entire society has the highest degree of interest in your congress' becoming truly a phase-making one, and in its opening a new page in the country's youth movement.

Both the report and the debates testify to the fact that the Komsomol understands its responsibility to the country, to the people, and that young people ardently wish to join even more vigorously in the process of deep changes, of the renewal of all aspects of the life of our society, the society in which you live and I live. This is a good attitude, one capable of giving meaning and inspiration in work and life. [applause]

The demanding atmosphere of your congress cannot fail to hearten us. It is in tune with the current stage in the country's development and with the acuteness and significance of problems being solved by our society today. We are sure that this atmosphere reflects the aspirations of all Soviet young people. Here, at the congress, everything points to the fact that young people feel themselves an inseparable part of the revolutionary processes taking place in our country. This is a significant phenomenon. It is a matter of the Komsomol's stand. On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, I greet Viktor Mironenko's statement that the Komsomol unambiguously supports restructuring. My understanding is that you support this too. [applause] We, comrades, see this as the stand of all the country's youth because you are their representatives. [applause]

I will say more: Your stand has huge political significance for the party. Yes, your congress is taking place during an exceptionally important period -- the time of bold initiatives and strenuous work. In its scale of social transformations it indisputably goes beyond the bounds of the routine course of life. And you, dear friends, are to take part in the revolutionary renewal of socialist society. [applause]

You have the giant economic potential of a great power in your hands -- the unique riches and beauty of our homeland, huge scientific achievements, and the humanitarian values and traditions of our culture and ideology. You are to continue the cause of the October Revolution and of preserving peace on earth. A huge responsibility lies on the shoulders of young people. The responsibility for their country, for the destiny of socialism, and for the peaceful future of the entire human civilization. Our party's comradely wish is: Do not spare any effort in trying to achieve lofty objectives because this is the most important thing in one's life. [applause]

The present time is a magnificent school of civic spirit, of coming to political and ideological maturity. Try to understand the essence of the changes that have begun as deeply as possible, try to perceive their innovative spirit and to better understand their significance for your generation and for society as a whole. Only such understanding -- the understanding of the depth, scale and innovative character of the changes connected with restructuring -- will become a real and lively stimulus for creative work, will help to achieve a clear idea about one's own place and role at one of the most crucial stages in the history of our socialist state. We want you to be active and aware participants in the restructuring. [applause] I would even take the risk and say: Don't take things on trust; make sure you understand everything. As the result of such understanding, draw the necessary conclusions for your life and activity. It is precisely this clear and conscientious stand which is needed to solve the tasks of restructuring.

Every generation has worked at solving the main tasks of its life, and I would like to remind you of it. But first I will recall the words of Vladimir Ilich when he said: the future of our young people profoundly excites me; They are part of the revolution. This was correct then, which Ilich said it, and it is no less important, significant, and true today, because the revolution is continuing. [applause]

While appraising our history in the strictest possible way -- seeing all its victories, achievements, mistakes, bitterness, and disappointments -- we nevertheless can say proudly: Having embarked on the path of October, our youth has justified the hopes of the fighters of the revolution. [applause] For some, for one generation it was the revolution, the Civil War, and the first 5-year plans. For others it was the Great Patriotic War.

The youth of others fell in the heroic years of postwar construction. You and your peers are taking the baton from those who opened up the virgin lands, discovered the oil desposits in the Tyumen region, built BAM, erected power stations in Siberia, and conquered the heights of scientific and technical progress. Out of selfless everyday work, the great things grow which make our people and the country great. [applause]

The youth of the land of the Soviets has always been worthy of its people, of its homeland, that reared and brought them up. That is how it was, and we in the CPSU are confident that that is the way it will continue. [applause]

Allow me, from the speaker's rostrum of the congress, on behalf of the party and the Komsomol, to express profound respect and cordial gratitude to your glorious predecessors, to those who accomplished one of the greatest revolutions in the life of mankind, who built and defended socialism, who strengthened the might of the USSR. [applause] Their deeds are a priceless part of history. They are forever in the memory of the people. These are the historic destinies of the country's great biography.

Comrades, the essence of the party's course toward renewal and restructuring is expressed in the concise formula: more socialism. Here lies the answer to the chief question regarding the viability of the society in which you and I live.

Seventy years of October have shown the powerful, vital resources of the socialist system. Socialism boasts immense social victories, universally recognized economic and cultural achievements, and inspiring historic prospects. We are rightly proud of this and realize the great values of the society in which we live.

But there is also another question. Are we satisfied with the present state of affairs? And here we are obliged to reply utterly realistically and outright: No, we are not satisfied. We are faced with the task of developing and utilizing all advantages and potentialities of socialism, its vast material and moral arsenal, its powerful revolutionary charge. When we say more socialism, we stress that we need a socialism that is constantly being rejuvenated and developed, capable of being in the vanguard of human civilization in economic, cultural and moral terms. [applause]

More socialism means more dynamism and creativity, better organization and order, more scientific foundations and initiative and economic management, more efficiency in administration. More socialism means more social justice, raising the prestige of labor, which is the top-priority value of socialist society. More socialism means more democratism, openness [glasnost], collectivism in our communal life, more culture, more humaneness in relations among people, more dignity and self-respect of the individual. More socialism means more aspiration for lofty patriotic deeds, more civic concern over the country's affairs, and more care for peace.

Our common duty, the duty of all generations of Soviet people, is to bring the motherland into the 21st century as a mighty, prospering power! [applause]

Comrades, it has been 2 years since we embarked on restructuring all spheres in the life of our society. Naturally, people are reflecting on what is happening, are assessing the changes already effected and those that are yet to come, comparing it with the past; they note these successes and failures of restructuring. Many pose the question: What have we managed to do, and what have we not? I will speak about the most important.

Over a short period, we have covered a considerable distance, the yardstick of history. It has been a path of truth, of critical reevaluation of reality, a difficult path of working out new ideas, concepts of the renewal of society. And it has brought its results: A profound analysis of the state of affairs in the country -- sharp criticism of negative phenomena and the growing democratization of life -- have become the beginning of a moral cleansing of society, the emancipation of people's minds, and of growth in the level of their social activity.

In a word, the past period has not been easy, but, in the final reckoning, it has been fruitful.

In this stage we have achieved that which is most vital: The ideas of renewal and of revolutionary changes have captured the consciousness of millions of people, and have won over the overwhelming majority of our people. Everything testifies to the fact that the tone of our public life is being set by the supporters of restructuring, and we believe that this process, this tendency, will intensify and build up. This is the main thing, comrades. [applause]

We have made some far-reaching decisions on the main directions of the implementation of restructuring, and on our political line worked out at the 27th party congress. They affect all areas of the economy, culture, and the social sphere, the life of party and public organizations, of labor collectives. Figuratively speaking, today we have an accurate compass, a checked azimuth has been mapped out; and the 2 years which have just elapsed have given us more certainty that the path we have chosen is correct -- the path toward acceleration and toward restructuring. The main thing now is to move forward, to shift the center of gravity to practical work in implementing the decisions that have been made. I do not want to say let's end the discussions. We are still going to need a lot of discussions to clear up more and more new questions which restructuring places and puts before us. Nevertheless, the decisive thing now is practical action.

We have no right to forget the lessons of the past. I have already spoken about this, but I am going to repeat it now. We made quite a lot of good decisions in the past, but they did not always lead to the serious changes that society was counting on; they did not do so primarily because they were not backed up by action. The CPSU Central Committee again and again calls everyone to action: Act, act, and act -- herein lies the guarantee of the success of restructuring at the present stage. We need fewer loud words and more practical deeds that speak loudly in their content. [applause] That, dear friends, is why we and those who are taking part in the congress on behalf of the party Central Committee and the Soviet Government have been very pleased with the businesslike tone of the Komsomol Congress and by your burning desire to promote restructuring with practical involvement, the energy of youth, and to assert its spirit and deeds. And it is quite natural that the following words of Lenin were quoted here: Only in labor, together with the workers and the peasants, is it possible to become real communists. That is the main task of a political alliance such as the Komsomol is. [applause]

Both in the report and in the speeches, delegates have turned to this thought of Lenin's more than once.

When we say the time has come for practical deeds, it is essential for the Komsomol to find its workplace everywhere, for it to take part in the solution of all tasks in restructuring, for it to fight against stagnation and come out actively in favor of changes for the better in the life of the country. I welcome the active position of the congress delegates, including those who have spoken from this platform. [applause]

Sometimes they ask: Are there opponents of restructuring? And if there are, who are they? Sometimes they even send me letters. They say: Mikhail Sergeevich, at least give us some names. I think that we have to make this matter clear. We have no political opponents. There is no opposition to restructuring. There are the difficulties of the initial stage of these revolutionary changes, and these difficulties affect all of us, in some measure or other. For all of us -- let's put it like this, we are all children of our own times. The braking mechanism which has come into being has not just existed of itself. There are those who are the specific carriers of it, both at the level of the Central Committee and the government, and of ministers, both in the republics and in the oblasts, and in the labor collectives, and they are even to be found in the Komsomol, although it was difficult for you to be infected with this conservative feeling. [applause]

The fact of the matter is that we must now think in a new way, act in a new way, and work in a new way; we must adopt new approaches to the resolution of the new tasks. That is where the difficulties and complexities of restructuring lie. This is the main difficulty.

As a result of an explanation like this, it will probably (lauffice) to say that there are people who have become accustomed to the old way of life and who do not want it to change, or who are changing it very slowly. Objectively, their stand is not in accordance with the spirit of restructuring. For instance, the increased demands and strict exactingness for the job one is given has not been to everyone's liking. When they have been told firmly that each must receive benefit only for work that has been accomplished, this has caused dissatisfaction for some. But tell me, is such a way of putting it not fair? Is it not dictated by the very process of our development? I think you will agree that this is not something dreamed up in an office, but that life requires it to be so. [applause]

Of course, it is no simple matter to overcome such an attitude, for many people have, over many years, become accustomed to receiving wages they have not earned, guaranteed bonuses, and so on and so forth. Serious economic and educational work is needed to eradicate the attitudes of living at others' expense and of consumerism. In our society, man's material and social status should be defined by work and work alone. [applause] To have these principles remain stable, persistent work is needed on a countrywide scale and within each labor collective -- especially within labor collectives. They are the ones that represent the backbone of restructuring and this is where the struggle is now taking place between the weakened initiative of the working people and all that is stagnant and has been spurred by life itself. [applause]

Naturally, a problem, particularly a problem like the struggle against bureaucracy, has to be singled out. An understanding of the importance of this task has been voiced at your congress. Are there guarantees for a successful struggle against the evil of bureaucracy in society? Yes there are, and you and I know what has to be done to that end. Above all, openness is necessary; criticism and the development of democratic principles, a further development of the democratic principles of our society are needed.

Nor is this a temporary, utilitarian need, as some people believe. It is a question of principle: Openness, criticism and democracy represent the driving forces of renewal, while their absence will again lead us to stagnation.

You know that the debate on whether is too much criticism, whether such extensive openness is needed, whether democracy will lead to some undesirable phenomena, is still continuing. We do not regard a phenomenon like this as negative. It shows concern for the stability of our society.

There are people who look as though they stand up for what is new, but when it comes to the crunch, they hedge in the development of democracy, criticism and openness with all manner of reservations and provisos.

I do not know how many statements I have made on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee on this question, but let me, say yet again, comrades: Criticism and openness ought to stand guard over the political and moral health of our society. [applause]

As for democracy, the time has come for everyone to understand -- it has indeed come -- that socialism simply cannot exist without genuine democracy, since socialism is a system of the working people; socialism is democracy. [applause]

Of course, democracy, as I have also already had occasion to say, is neither anarchy nor a state of affairs where anything goes; it is not the settling of personal scores, nor is it an opportunity for discrediting anyone for the sake of one's own gain. Incidentally, such things do happen, although only in individual cases. One cannot turn a magazine, a newspaper or the mass media -- this public platform -- into something for the settling of personal accounts. Genuine democracy is inseparable from honesty, good order, responsibility, directness of opinion and respect for the opinion of others, from strict observance of the laws and the standards of socialist communal life. As for the actions of people who try, for their own personal objectives, to get rich at the expense of democracy, here, too, the best means of combat is openness [gleason], the creation of public opinion of a kind that will lay bare egotism, demagogic dissoluteness and attempts to use democracy for the sake of gain.

The opinion of the party Central Committee is as follows: Openness, criticism and democracy are vitally necessary in order to move resolutely forward the whole business of restructuring. [applause] And if, under the new conditions, anyone tries to revive the worthless trends and manifestations we condemned at the party congress in front of the whole country -- and we received the complete approval of our people -- then I believe we must not permit this. What am I thinking of? In the past a great deal of what took place negatively was linked with the fact that there were whole areas beyond criticism and beyond checking by the people, beyond checking even by the party and the Central Committee. Now this happened has already been told and I do not want to return now to an explanation of the reasons -- but it happened.

So do we not want to replace that with a situation in which new areas of life in our society have made their appearance, new organizations, new personalities, new figures at whatever level, be it rayon or all-union, who are beyond the reach of criticism and beyond the reach of checking? I think that we have reached the correct conclusions, and we must be guided by those conclusions today. What do you think? [applause] That applause is of special value. [applause]

Indeed, you will understand, since you have come from all corners of the country, you know real life, it is all before you; and you can present it now when you go back to your places of work and residence. And you know that the new stage of the development of socialist democracy is only just unfolding, only gaining strength, and that is why we so desperately need the atmosphere of activity and openness [otkrytost], which is becoming increasingly strong in the country today, because this is a working, business-like atmosphere, without which — I repeat again — there will be no restructuring.

Restructuring, comrades, is for man. People will now judge restructuring on how its ideas and intentions are clothed in the flesh and blood of real actions, on what changes they will bring to the everyday life of millions. It is a matter of the sincerity of our policy. The worst thing now would be to make out the desired object as the reality, to adjust the results to fit, to depict successes and achievements where they do not yet exist, to paint changes which have not yet happened.

Trust in the restructuring will be undermined if we do not deal with perhaps the most dangerous enemy: window-dressing and the habituation to it which has taken deep root among broad circles of our society. The most urgent task is to ensure restructuring is deeds. Those who would like to restrict themselves to talking about restructuring must be resolutely pushed aside. There must be no concessions on our part in this main question. This is precisely how the matter stands. [applause] We can understand that every person will need a differing amount of time, and we must give everyone his own chance to reflect on the time in which he is now living, and on where the country is, and to restructure himself.

Evidently it is in the rates of restructuring that the personality and psychological make-up of the person will be displayed, his level of political maturity. In every case this will take place individually. This can be understood. But against those who try to jump on the bandwagons of restructuring, to drown restructuring in chatter and to reduce it to this, we must be vigilant. We need restructuring in its essence, for life, for the people, for socialism, and not for mere words. [applause]

Comrades, the main party concern today, as far as problems of the country's youth movement are concerned, is to open up for young people the very broadest perspective, to open the doors wide for them everywhere, in all directions of economic, scientific, and technical progress, social creativity and spiritual development. To do this means to give young men and women space for independence, to free them from petty tutelage and supervision, to bring them up with real action, real responsibility, and trust. [applause] In order to lift young people to carry out the most complex tasks, as we see it, appeals and slogans do not suffice. The enthusiasm of youth must be underpinned by active concern for the fate of young people.

What do we mean? As we see it in the CPSU Central Committee, major directions in work with young people at the present stage are, first: It is essential to create all conditions for mass participation of young people in the processes of renewal and democratization of society, to help them to master the political culture of socialism in practice. The future of socialist democracy is connected with the development of mechanisms of competitiveness in the economy, in science, and in spiritual life, with the expansion of self-management at all levels, with raising the role of the personal initiative of every person. You must master the entire arsenal of means available under sovereignty of the people, inspire the democratization of the life of the country with your youthful energy. On the other hand, it is only with real experience of democratization, with your own practical experience, however difficult it is at times, that you will be able to instill in yourselves and in your contemporaries a civic attitude and a communist outlook, patriotic pride and careful alertness, principledness, and firmness of character.

Of course, there can also be difficulties on this path, and some temporary hold-ups. Today all of us, not just young people, need to learn to live and work according to the laws and norms of developing democracy, to develop immunity to various sorts of infantile diseases connected with the deepening of this process. And we must not be afraid of it. Social experience, practice, real life, and folk wisdom -- everything will be put in its place and judged on its merits. It is important today that we all learn and teach young people social creation, for without that no progress will be possible, and without progress there can be no acceleration, and we shall not attain the goals we have set.

Second: We must show serious concern for constant renewal and for the enrichment of the intellectual potential of society. The need for this is dictated both by social and by scientific and technical prospects. All of us representatives of the CPSU Central Committee and of the Soviet Government -- it is with profound satisfaction that I say this -- approve enormously the depth and seriousness of the discussion by your congress of the question of what the Komsomol's contribution should be to the country's economic and social development. Yes comrades [applause], our economy is faced with truly immense tasks, both in scale and in novelty. And the most difficult tasks are in this 5-year-plan period. We must withstand the most difficult 2 or 3 years ahead when, simultaneously, we must solve big tasks on the move, create all the prerequisites -- political, economic, organizational, legal, psychological, spiritual, moral -- for restructuring, and at the same time we have to move forward. This is perhaps the most difficult, but also perhaps the most -- obviously the most -- interesting period. [applause]

In this 5-year plan period we must virtually completely modernize our domestic machine-building and bring it to the level of world requirements in the main parameters.

When we were sorting things out last year before the June Central Committee plenum, many machine-building industries were producing goods to world standards to a maximum of 50 percent, and sometimes 25-30 percent. How shall we set new labor productivity frontiers; how shall we solve questions of automation and mechanization; how shall we ensure rapid rates of transformation? After all, we must get answers to many questions concerning the economy, and here, too, the prerequisites are being created for implementing the strong social policy we worked out. We need genuine breakthroughs in industry, particularly in domestic machine-building, and with scientific and technical progress. The foundations for this breakthrough are being laid today, decided today. Therefore, the exceptionally complicated and new tasks of the present years of the 12th 5-Year Plan present completely new demands to everyone, primarily to young people. Your generation must be ready to take part in a major modernization of our economy, an organic combining of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism. What we do in the 12th 5-Year Plan in domestic machine-building and in science should then transform itself into and change the face of our entire national economy. At the same time, we are also mastering new methods of management and administration -- financial autonomy, self-recouping, quality. I want to welcome the precise, clear, civic attitude of young workers and engineers who have genuinely shown support for the party line of raising quality, and who have supported the state acceptance system, despite the fact that it has very sharply affected the entire workforce, and has posed problems. [applause]

In the 2 years -- and this, perhaps, is the most important fact in practical terms which has revealed the position of our working class, of the working people of the country, because, in the first months of this year people in some areas have been unpaid, but still the opinion of workers has reached us that we will no longer receive wages for poor-quality output. [as heard]

You know, this is such a simple, lucid and precise position which consists of the support of the country's working class for the demands of restructuring and for the tasks of acceleration, and from this platform I would like to greet the young workers and young engineers who are representing the country's young working class at the congress, and all the country's working people. [applause]

Comrades, we value the understanding of our policy on the part of our people, and this policy will serve as the source of development and improvements both for today and tomorrow if it is well understood by our people and supported in a practical way. If it is not, then this policy is dead and the country will not progress. That is why I considered it so necessary to single out this question in particular.

A broad panorama of the practical deeds of the Komsomol and of young people has been presented in the report and in delegates' speeches. Backed up by the experience of my own trips around the country, too, I would like to reaffirm the veracity of what has been said. Young people in our country really do find themselves at the most difficult sectors of opening up the country, at the principal trends of the struggle for scientific-technical progress, and take upon their shoulders even today an immense burden of responsibility for the development of the economy. We perceive this, comrades, we value this, and I believe that the people perceive this and the whole of our people perceive this and the whole of our people value this, too. [applause]

Recently I had occasion to get acquainted with many labor affairs of our young people, in the Far East, in Siberia, in the Ukraine, in Moscow, in Leningrad, and in the Baltic republics. I could say a lot on this issue. But in order to emphasize the idea that the Central Committee and the government have -- which is what we are counting on -- the help of young people in resolving immense and difficult, complex, and new tasks in the economy, I would like to cite just one example which confirms that young people are already doing a lot, and resolving perhaps the most important tasks, which will have enormous consequences for the development of scientific-technological progress in the country.

I recently became acquainted with the work of a young scientific collective which is resolving what I would call a top-priority task for our science and economy: the creation of supercomputer. Such production complexes are essential for us today in order to create powerful systems to control major installations, to automate planning and modeling, to do global weather-forecasting and to master space, to resolve major tasks in science and technology and in the country's defense tasks. And the development of very intricate complexes was entrusted to young people, Komsomol members, yesterday's higher education graduates. Specialists in various spheres, they formed creative youth collectives and worked selflessly and with dedication. I was struck by the fact that among these people there were no questions about pay, or about the time they worked; they were all absorbed by this idea. And this unbounded dedication to the job and their high qualifications helped them to make a breakthrough in these most important areas of our development. I saw the result of this immense work. A universal computer which carries out 125 million operations a second has been created and already put into serial production; it can perform certain special tasks at one order higher. In the next few years this collective will complete creating a computer with a productivity of over 1 billion operations a second -- during this 5-year plan; while in the following 5-year plan, about midway through, a computer will be created with a productivity of over 10 billion operations a second.

From the speakers' rostrum of your congress I wish to mention the names of (Sergey Tarasov), (Fedor Grosdov), (Vladimir Volin), (Shamil Alaudinov), (Valentin Khrabov), (Vladimir Grebenatchikov).

And I will name their senior mentors, our prominent scientists Valiyev, Ryabov -- Comrades Valiyev, Ryabov, Babayan and Nazaryan. [applause] I would like to greet them. [applause]

A great many assumptions are being made by some people regarding the Soviet Union's lagging behind in scientific and technical progress, including solving the task of developing a supercomputer. Let them hear this information from the speaker's rostrum today. [applause]

In this area a young people's collective of Novosibirsk scientists, under the direction of a young doctor of sciences, Comrade (Kotov), is at the same time developing a promising super minicomputer of a new generation, and has achieved good results. Already at an early stage of development it has been joined by a young people's collective of the Integral production association in Minsk, which will make it possible to ensure a quick realization of the project and its being made available to the economy in general. [applause] And these are only events and achievements in one area of the restructuring of the economy and of its being raised to advanced levels.

I am confident, dear comrades, that the Komsomol, the country's young people, will speak their weighty word in resolving the tasks of scientific and technical progress and of the modernization of the country's economy. [applause]

The new technical reconstruction of production and the accelerated mastering of the most advanced technologies have set tasks for the general education and polytechnic training of all, of the whole of our society, of all workers of our society, and of course, first and foremost, of the young people, tasks which are unprecedented in their novelty. Production must receive workers who are computer-literate, with a high degree of culture, who from their childhood have had habits of organized labor and high discipline inculcated in them.

Naturally, the new tasks oblige us to create a new system of labor education. We have got down to that work in a solid way in the party Central Committee and in the government, with participation of both scientists and leaders of the corresponding industries. Major decisions have been made on school reform, both comprehensive and vocational. Major decisions have been made -- and I believe they have been published already -- on developing our higher school at the present stage, on the new demands made of it by life, and with which it must be in line.

I would even put it in the following way: It is here, in this area, that the chief task is being resolved, and prerequisites of the pace of our progress, restructuring itself, are being created, the chief persona dramatis of restructuring is the people, the individual. Restructuring needs the individual who is intelligent, dedicated to the cause of socialism, but at the same time competent, professionally trained. The efforts of many will have to be united and coordinated here.

We take note of your self-criticism concerning the Komsomol's work in the sphere of the general-education schools, vocational education, and higher education. This goes to show the Komsomol's important task. Unfortunately, we are hearing too little self-criticism on the part of the leaders of the state's departments which are responsible for resolution of this important task. [applause] We shall say that today, so far, the reform in the general-education school is spinning its wheels. [applause] That means that the work of the USSR Ministry of Education, and of all its bodies, is spinning its wheels. [applause]

And what about the stand of the party and Soviet bodies? Where are their influence and authority? That also has to be mentioned today. We believe that both the party organizations and collectives of the Ministry of Education, of the system of vocational and technical training, of our higher school, as well as those of the industrial ministries should be decisively restructured. I would say that the way in which they restructure will have very strong influence on restructuring in the country. We are not, therefore, going to tolerate stagnation and meditation there, as happened in pedagogical science, when they spent decades sometimes clearing up questions that were clear and that had been solved by practice long ago. [applause]

An enormous scientific potential and many competent people have been concentrated in our ministries which have the responsibility of training cadres in our country and of teaching the people, and we are counting on them to draw conclusions in their work from today's discussions. The Komsomol is capable of leading the campaign on their behalf and is under an obligation to do so. This is something I welcome on behalf of the Central Committee and the government. I believe that that was said in Comrade Mironenko's report. [applause] There isn't any need for you to take upon yourselves the obligations of ministries and departments: You simply have to leave no one in peace. [applause] And that is something you can do. [laughter and applause] The more so, in my view, given that new opportunities for this are going to be opened up for you when the decisions of the congress and changes in the rules are adopted, when new opportunities are opened up for the development of independence and initiative on the part of the Komsomol, both in schools and in higher educational establishments. [applause]

Third, most careful attention is required by the complex knot of problems concerning social development. We have taken close to our hearts, comrades, the sharp and worrying speeches about the social development of young people, particularly with regard to ensuring social living conditions at new construction sites, at new towns, with regard to the state of affairs in hostels, and so on.

We have already made a practical start to certain matters mentioned here, both in the report and in the speeches, and we are resolving them. Other matters are new to us, and they will be considered. I think that we are agreed, in the leadership of the Central Committee and the government, that after everything said here at the congress which is of all-union significance is summed up by the Komsomol Central Committee and submitted to the CPSU Central Committee and the government, we will try to give everything careful consideration. [applause]

We can understand that the way young people feel in society and their social vitality depend on these matters. They include housing problems, creating the necessary conditions for the young family, having an opportunity to show of what they are capable -- in brief, matters that young people connect with the very concept of social justice, and which, as I have already said, are being talked about pointedly, but rightly so, at the Komsomol Congress. Work with young people cannot be divorced from the whole spectrum of cultural-educational tasks, from the ideological moral forming of the individual. We cannot permit a gap between the growth of material well-being and the spiritual maturity of the person.

Today it is clearly visible that many of the difficulties of restructuring and renovation of society are caused by a deficiency of culture in the broadest understanding of the word. High-technology equipment cannot exist and develop without the corresponding cultural infrastructure, nor without the further enhancement of work standards and of the whole way of people's life. Any gap between these spheres threatens social spasms for our society.

It is the historic mission of socialism to elevate man, to create conditions for the comprehensive development of his abilities. We are in favor of the consistent implementation of a system of measures, through the party, state and economic bodies and public organizations, as a result of which every young person may feel he is firmly involved in all the country's affairs and concerns. [applause] In this connection the idea expressed at the congress about drawing up and passing a law on young people seems to us to be well-founded. [applause]

Let us examine this question. Obviously, the law on young people ought to strengthen even more the guarantees of the rights of young men and women in all spheres of life in society in the country. After all, even if this law should be an aggregate of all that has been decided to date, which sets down the rights and also the obligations of young people — in itself this will be of tremendous significance. However, it is also possible to introduce something new, taking account of what is being said at this congress and what is being prompted by life itself.

I wish to state to the Komsomol Congress that the CPSU Central Committee and the government will firmly pursue the 27th CPSU Congress line with regard to the strict observance of the principles of social justice. The socialist way of life can only recognize one hierarchy: the hierarchy of personal merits, based upon abilities, knowledge, experience, strength of character, and aspiration toward high social ideals. That should be the criterion. [applause]

It is the Komsomol's business to stand guard over young people's social confidence. I think that your union will act correctly if it develops a most extensive and public competition among young people. Competition in everything: in learning — is there something here that gives rise to incomprehension on your part? [audience murmurs] Something else does! [laughter, applause]

I wish to appeal to you for the Komsomol to be the soul of competition in everything: in learning; in work; in artistic, scientific, and technical creativity; in the organization of leisure. However, comrades, a competition understood anew, so that it reveals young people's talents, so that through this competition prerequisites are created for men's merits and abilities to be manifested.

Moreover, I shall say that competitions for the right of promotion and leadership should be included in that competition. [applause]

The CPSU Central Committee sees the tasks of party organizations also in standing resolutely everywhere against treating young people as objects to be used, in ensuring caring attitudes to work and life of the country's young generation. It was justly said here yesterday that many leaders remember young people when the situation in this or that affair gets complicated, but very often forget about them when social issues are being resolved. Such an approach is condemned by us. [applause]

In the framework of active social policies, we all should effect a resolute change for the better.

Comrades, a very important and committed conversation is being conducted at your congress. That is understandable, taking into account the tasks dwelled upon at the congress, about which I spoke — among others on the role and place of Leninist Komsomol at the present stage of society's development, in the system of our democracy, on what we want the Komsomol to look like today. That is an issue of crucial, principal significance — not only for young people but also for our society.

Life has shown quite acutely that many Komsomol committees have become captives of bureaucratic methods of work. Instead of live action, a whirlpool of pointless meetings and paper; instead of open and widescale communication with young people, pompous events, vociferous reports, and far-fetched initiatives. A very great number of organizations have come into being in the Komsomol, about which it can be said that they are organizations of unfinished initiatives. This is a dangerous and harmful malaise, and it has to be overcome.

At times, when we observe the work of the Komsomol aktiv, we are under the impression that young people walk on one side of the street, and Komsomol activities walk on the other, sometimes even in the opposite direction. [applause]

I think this is largely associated with the general situation in the country, with the atmosphere in society. We shall not blame young people. [applause] But an elite has also made its appearance in the Komsomol. This is felt in a very painful way by all young people. Is it really permissible that as soon as someone in the higher educational establishments gets a leading -- let's put it this way, perhaps not a leading post, but a place in the Komsomol aktiv, some elected work -- then they get freedom of access to people. This gives rise to surprise on the part of all young people who are students. They should be setting an example in the main work. And what is this work during one's years as a student? It is the mastery of knowledge. Freedom of access. Examinations approach and they present lists to the dean's office and even the rector's office, give a pass, give [pauses] -- bear in mind the fact that this is the aktiv.

This is a shameful manifestation in the Komsomol. What kind of privilege is this? The Komsomol aktiv has only one privilege, that of showing that it has the moral right to head the student's Komsomol or the school Komsomol -- if we're talking about the school Komsomol -- or the workers' Komsomol. We have to resolutely end these manifestations which poison the atmosphere, the healthy atmosphere of our Komsomol. [applause] But I want to say once again that the blame here is not just on the Komsomol. This is payment for the manifestations that we have been characteristic of society during past decades, payment for omissions in the education of young people, for formalism in the party leadership of the Komsomol. But the Komsomol does not have any right to avoid responsibility for this kind of situation. In my view this is also a correct way of presenting the matter. [applause] We are impressed by the fact that the current congress is discussing questions concerning its internal life from precisely these positions.

Restructuring has today stirred up our whole society, and it is a good thing that young people are unwilling to reconcile themselves to things it would appear they had long ago become accustomed to. We Communists see intolerance of this kind as the norm of life in the activity of the Komsomol. The Komsomol must be uncompromising in its attitude toward everything that contradicts the values of socialism and the ideals of socialism.

The debates and searches which the Komsomol, our closest helper and reserve, is carrying out, are dear to us in the Central Committee. And that is precisely how we wish to see our younger generation -- involved, critical of thought, and demanding. [applause]

How can we achieve this? Which of your tasks should be brought to the forefront? Here we should take counsel with Lenin. Vladimir Ilich never had the slightest doubt that the Komsomol was, first and foremost, a political organization [applause] participating in tackling the most varied questions of the life of the country.

Nevertheless, the Komsomol should recall Lenin's instruction about the need to lead the younger generation, to be at its head in organizational and ideological matters. [applause] On the basis of these standpoints Vladimir Ilich considered that broad, organizational independence and the development of working on its own initiative were, for the Komsomol, compulsory. Without this, young people would not be able to make themselves into fine specialists [pauses], socialists, nor to prepare themselves to be able to lead socialism forward. Those were Lenin's words. The Komsomol is a school of civic and political maturity, a school of shaping a person on socialist principles, which sets as its objective the education of an individual devoted to our ideals.

The Komsomol today is called upon to be the young guard of restructuring. [applause] Restructuring needs people with firm, civic principles, convinced of the ideology of socialism, who are capable of matching up to their moral duty, who can stand up firmly for the truth without bowing to subservience and hypocrisy. The social significance of courageous and bold people who are prepared to fight for the decisions which have been adopted, and of the intelligent and conscientious champions and devotees of socialism, has never been higher than it is today. Restructuring needs self-dependent people who do not look for instructions for each little thing, but take responsibility on themselves and see through to the end everything that they have started, whether it be big or small.

People have been saying to me that here -- maybe at the congress, or perhaps I read it in the press recently -- that they are now complaining that the Komsomol has little initiative and little self-dependence. But, you know, they recalled that it starts with the school's Komsomol, before the Komsomol, at the higher educational establishments and enterprises, where people are already adults.

The Komsomol is deprived of independence. Everywhere there are guardians. The school Komsomol cannot take a single step without the teachers and the headmaster. The rayon or town Komsomol cannot take a single step without the party raykom or gorkom. Is that really party guidance for the Komsomol? [prolonged applause] Yes, I can feel that the question is ripe [laughter and applause] if not to say over-ripe. [laughter and applause]

Let us correct this situation together. The CPSU Central Committee will draw conclusions from the present congress, the 20th Komsomol Congress. We will strive to act toward the youth movement, and first and foremost the Komsomol, the political vanguard of Soviet youth, in the spirit of Leninist traditions. [applause] And let's agree that the Komsomol should be involved in everything in the country. There is a certain proportion of young people who have closed themselves off in their own narrow little world; they have departed, or are trying to depart, from the mainstream, the tempestuous mainstream of life. This is a mistake for a young person. And so today, as never before, there is a need for the Komsomol, the VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth Union], to act as an energetic political organization of young people. [applause] The excited and bold voice of the Komsomol should be heard everywhere, at the factories, on the stock farm, in the school and the higher educational establishment, in the design office, on theatre stages, urging action, creativity, innovation. I am convinced that the Komsomol will find the strength and resolve to overcome the past, and that the real life of young people and the interests of the country will everywhere become the content of its work. And you can count on us. [applause]

Comrades, we are living in a complicated, contradictory world, but one which is interconnected, as was said at the 27th party congress. Our society is changing. Our ideas about socialism are being enriched. Spiritual values and positions of world outlook are confronting one another in the international arena.

And the Komsomol is called upon to help young people -- help them both through study and through discussion. Incidentally, there has been too little discussion. In my opinion, the Komsomol's life has been enriched with discussion only during the period preceding the congress. But, you see, discussion in the Komsomol is the main way of forming positions -- both political and civil. [applause]

In our country, even students are not given the opportunity to discuss social disciplines at their seminars. [applause]

We have tormented our young people with sermons. [applause]

However, Leninist thought is that one can only become a Communist by participating in practical matters with which the working class and the peasantry are engaged, that the Komsomol in every town and village must resolve even the smallest, most routine practical task. And indeed, only through work with workers and peasants, by participating in the political process, in all matters of society's life, can one form a political and civic position. I am not denying the role of lectures. They are part of study, and are a necessary part in the process of life, especially of a young person. But in the final analysis, they do not form personality.

So the Komsomol, by its work, should provide reference points. It must take a critical approach to the standards and the morals of the bourgeois way of life. It must view and evaluate social phenomena from scientific, Marxist-Leninist positions. It is a very complex world, particularly if one takes into account the fact that many people are taking the trouble to insinuate false values, to distract the young person -- and not only in the socialist countries, but also in the Western world -- to distract the young person from active political struggle; from participation in social processes; to urge him into a world of narrow problems so that he will become, so to speak, politically anemic.

But we are Communists. Our socialist system has an interest in young people who are active and politically mature, who take part in resolving all questions of the present time. But for this, in order to take up a position, to determine one's place in life, it is necessary to see this world clearly in all its interrelationships, in all the complexities and contradictions, and to understand it and the main trend of its development.

Who, when young, has not tormented himself over moral choice and the meaning of life? Who has not pondered about happiness and justice, about the destiny of mankind? And it is very important that, precisely in their early years, at a time of the greatest receptivity and interest in life, our young people should turn to the life-giving source of Marxism-Leninism, for this teaching has emerged as the answer to the most burning problems of human existence, with all its concerns, anxieties, and hopes. All in all, we must merge into one the process of the revolutionary renewal of our society and the process of the ideological and moral upbringing of the person.

Our present time richly nourishes feelings of civic duty; our history, too, must be its source. Remember, comrades, the significance Lenin attached to the formation of historical consciousness. He considered as a most important political cause the preparation of a course of the fatherland's history that would be scientific in method and content, popular in its presentation, and vivid in its style. Surely today it is not beyond us; surely we are not lacking in scientific and literary forces that can write the history of the motherland and the party? This must be an honest, courageous and fascinating book revealing the heroic path of the country and the party in all its greatness, the path of the trailblazers. [applause]

Essential to this will be the dramatic character of events and human destinies; it will contain no blank pages, subjective preferences and antipathies, and its value will not depend on time-serving factors. [applause]

Continuing the theme of education, I would like to say something more. Attempts are made to depict many flaws in education solely as stemming from objective circumstances. But is man really only the passive product of circumstances? Are not the circumstances themselves really created by people? I think, and I am convinced, that a person with firm political convictions and moral principles remains himself in the most unfavorable circumstances. He does not tread the path of worldly opportunism, of compromises of conscience.

He does not seek ways to get away from active life. We know that millions of Communists and people who do not belong to the party did not, even during the most difficult time, give up their principles and convictions. The decisive and beneficial changes now taking place in our country have become possible precisely thanks to this. [applause]

All this, to a high degree, represents the manifestation of the devotion to one's people, the cause of socialism; the manifestation of profound patriotism. After all, it is not those who utter beautiful words of love for the motherland. It is those who, on seeing difficulties, unsolved problems, do not whine, do not panic, do not nurse their selfish grievances, but, having rolled up their sleeves, overcome obstacles -- these are true patriots! [applause] And, comrades, the genuine patriot is, without fail, an internationalist. [applause] The entire history of our socialist motherland confirms the deepest link between patriotism and internationalism. We have arrived, literally through suffering, at this understanding of patriotism as an irreconcilable rejection of nationalism, chauvinism, and racism. [brief applause] Man is not born with the genes of an internationalist or a nationalist: It depends on him, on education, and on society what he will become like in life. Each new generation of Soviet people has to acquire anew feelings of internationalism in relations between nations, in joint learning and work. After all, dear friends, we all live in a multinational country, and friendship among peoples represents a great achievement that belongs to our country. [applause]

In this connection I cannot speak without heartfelt emotion about the thousands of young Soviet men who have undergone the test of fire in Afghanistan. They have shown themselves to be genuine internationalists, helping the fraternal people to defend its revolutionary gains, and genuine patriots defending the security of the southern frontiers of our homeland. [applause]

On behalf of the party Central Committee -- and I think on your behalf, too -- I want to tell all those who have gone through the Afghanistan school: The country and the people are proud of your courage, your bravery, and your valor. [applause] These qualities, displayed in the most difficult conditions, are also valuable in civilian life, and we have no doubt that they will remain with you throughout your lives, dear Soviet servicemen.

I would like to make use of this rostrum to address the Army Komsomol, and those who have already completed their service in the Armed Forces, those who have fought for the just cause in Afghanistan. Go to the adolescents, tell them about yourselves and your comrades, your commanders and instructors, about courage and heroism, and about combat fraternity. [applause]

Comrades, the party can well see the difficulty of the tasks and the complexity of the problems facing the Komsomol.

It understands guidance of the Komsomol, first and foremost, as giving it constant comradely assistance, seeing a primary duty for itself in this.

Dear friends, young people always have the closest, most direct relations with the future of society, but for today's young people this is doubly true. The development of civilization today is more and more rubbing out the line between the possible and the impossible. The colossal scientific-technological power and intellectual potential that is coming into your hands is such as has never been in the hands of any generation of mankind living on earth. Today, virtually everything that has been thought of can be realized by technology -- both good and evil, both that which saves and that which is ruinous. And coming into power over this might, remember that you are creating the future. [applause]

Every person dreams of happiness. However, it is only the person who, having cast aside all petty things, is going forward and only forward, toward lofty human aims, that is truly happy. [applause] We Communists, all the older generation, believe that young people will justify the expectations of the party and the people, and will not let them down. [applause]

The CPSU Central Committee, on behalf of Communists, sends ardent greetings to the congress delegates and guests, to the many-millions-strong Leninist Komsomol, and to all young people of the country of the Soviets.

We wish you great creative boldness, and may all go well for you! [applause]

TURKMEN CP CC PLENUM PROMOTES, EXPELS OFFICIALS

PM161301 Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKHA in Russian 29 Mar 87 p 1

[Unattributed "Information Report on Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The routine Seventh Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Plenum was held 28 March.

The plenum discussed the question "On the Republic Party Organization's Tasks To Fulfill the Decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum 'On Restructuring and the Party's Cadre Policy.'"

The report was delivered by S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee.

The following people spoke in the debate: Yu.K. Mogilevets, first secretary of Ashkhabad party obkom; A. Khodshamurodov, chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers; Dzh. Shaklycheva leader of a construction team in the Sakar-Chaginatly Rayon Interkolkhoz Construction Organization; R. Khudayberdiyev, first secretary of Chadzhou party obkom; M.M. Gatsenko, weaver at Ashkhabad's Dzerzhinskiy Cotton Textile Combine; N.T. Suyunov, chief of the Turkmen SSR Geology Administration; T. Amangeldyyeva, chairman of the Turkmen SSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade; Yu.Ye. Leschinskiy, second secretary of Mary Party Obkom; M. Aymedova, actress at the Turkmen State Young Persons' Theater named for A. Kulmamedov; B. Saitova, party organization secretary at the Bespoke tailoring factory in the city of Tashauz; S.N. Muradov, rector of the Turkmen Polytechnical Institute; Ye.T. Mitrin, first secretary of Krasnovodsk Party Obkom; A. Orazov, chairman of the Lenin Kolkhoz in Takhtinskiy Rayon; G.M. Shpak, first secretary of Bezmein Party Gorkom; O. Musayev, director of the Turkmen Communist Party Institute of Party History; O. Bayramov, first secretary of Tashauzskiy party raykom; A. Yazdzhumayeva, member of the Pobeda Kolkhoz in

Iskenderbek Sapozov; S. Gashapov, chief of the Turkmen SSR Central Statistical Administration; S. Nakhiliev, chairman of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; S.S. Luyba, second secretary of Turkmen Party (KPK); V.I. Nikanov, director of the Turkmen Nitrogen Fertilizer Plant; L.A. Iskhakova, leader of a team of geologists in the Chardzhou Large-Scale Housing Construction Trust's Housing Construction Administration No. 1; and N.A. Oshakov, chief of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers Trade and Consumer Services Department.

The plenum adopted an appropriate resolution on the question under consideration.

The plenum confirmed organizational questions. V.I. Shlyapnikov and L.A. Mikhovskiy were relieved of their duties as members of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Bureau.

The plenum elected S.M. Ivanov, who previously worked as first secretary of Iskenderbek Party Kapsan, secretary and member of the Bureau of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee.

A. Garbuzova, carpet maker at the Turkmenkhan Production Association, was elected member of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Bureau.

The plenum confirmed the following appointments: V.I. Shubertov as chief of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Organizational Party Work Department; L.A. Iskhakova as chief of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Administration Organ Department; S. Stalshov as chief of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Economic Department; V.A. Shcherbov as chief of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Party Central Commission; N. Khoshkayev as editor of the republic journal *TRAKHTOVAYA KOMUNISTI*; and V.A. Shchukin as editor of the republic newspaper *TRAKHTOVAYA DZHA*.

The plenum presented the following from candidates to full member of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee: S. Khallayev, dredge operator in the Turkmenkhan Production Association's Public Production Union No. 7; T. Amanguliyev, chairman of the Turkmen SSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade; S. Amanguliyev, electrician at the Maryskhaya (KPS) named for the 50th anniversary of the USSR; S. Nakhliyeva, machine operator at the Kaptalov Kalkhan, Iskenderbek Sapozov; T.F. Galimovskiyev, telephonist at the Kaptalov Telephone and Telegraph Exchange; A.K. Shcherbov, Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee administrator of affairs; A. Ivanov, millmaid in the Kaptalov Kalkhan, Novokhalkhan Sapozov; V.A. Shubertov, chief of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Party Organizational Work Department; and Kh. Khoshkayev, petroleum and gas extraction operator at the Turkmenkhan Production Association's Kaptalov's Petroleum and Gas Extraction Administration named for the 50th anniversary of the Turkmen SSR.

The plenum relieved V.I. Grishchenko of his post as chief of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee Petroleum, Gas, and Chemical Industry Department in view of his transfer to other work.

The plenum expelled N. Skypov and A.M. Iskhakova from the CPSU for having compromised themselves.

I. Pashayev, A. Galimov, S. Islyayev, S. Shcherbov, S.A. Ivanov and A. Khallayev were removed from the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee in view of serious shortcomings in their work.

III. 17 Apr 67

0 19

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS
POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

V.B. Tarnopolsky was removed from the Turkestan Communist Party Auditing Commission for serious shortcomings in his work.

S.A. Toms and V.V. Radovskiy, senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee apparatus, took part in the plenum.

CPSU AGENT SUSPECTS GROWING NUCLEAR PLANT LEAK

APR Report

DISSEMINATED FOR: APR 14 English DISM DMT 13 Apr 67

[Telex] Bonn, April 13 (APF) -- A West German environmental agency on Sunday [13 April] said it suspected there had recently been another accident in a Soviet nuclear plant, after it had monitored a sharp increase in airborne radioactivity in mid-March.

A spokesman for the federal environment ministry said here that a rise was simultaneously recorded in Finland, southern Sweden, Switzerland and Austria. Bonn is studying the report, and has not yet decided whether to ask an official explanation from the Soviet Union, he said. The agency, the Institute of Atmospheric Radioactivity, said the increase in radioactivity, in iodine-131, krypton-85 and cesium-137, could only be due to a radioactive leak emanating from a nuclear plant in central Russia. The institute, based in the southwestern town of Freiburg, said there was at least four times the normal level of radioactivity in West Germany between March 10 and 14, going from a weekly average of 10 to 100 becquerels per cubic meter of air to between 400 and 500 becquerels per cubic meter.

In its edition appearing Tuesday, the West Berlin daily TRANSMITTUNG quoted a nuclear physician from Bremen, Gerald Kirchner, as commenting that the rise in radioactivity was due to an incident in the same type of reactor as the one that leaked in Chernobyl.

Foreign Ministry Rejection

DISSEMINATED FOR: BOMBURG DISM IN German DISM DMT 14 Apr 67

[Excerpt] Bonn (DISM) -- The source of the increased radioactivity in early March remains unclear. The Soviet Foreign Ministry has again said the German Embassy in Moscow that it rejects as "rue" speculation that the source was in the Soviet Union. Its spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov gave an assurance that Soviet monitors had not shown any increased levels of radiation.

The Soviet statement was passed on to the Federal Environment Ministry in Bonn by telex, spokesman Claude Conrad said on Thursday in response to a DISM inquiry. The ministry sought information from Moscow after Swedish experts in particular accused on the basis of another data that the source must lie in central Russia. [passage omitted]

Further Details

DISSEMINATED FOR: Moscow DISM IN English DISM DMT 17 Apr 67

[Telex] Moscow April 17 DISM -- A leading Soviet nuclear power industry official has said that background radiation levels in the 30-kilometer zone around the Chernobyl nuclear power station, where an accident took place a year ago, have dropped substantially over the past months.

III. 17 Apr 87

8 20

USSR NATIONAL AFFAIRS
POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Speaking in an interview with a USSR correspondent, Boris Khashtkin, a deputy chief of a Directorate at the Ministry of the Nuclear Power Industry, explained that "this is only natural" in view of continuing decontamination operations in the area.

"I can tell you that all Soviet nuclear power stations are operating properly and their technical conditions give specialists no cause for criticism," he told the correspondent.

Erk Prudyshev, head of the ministry's Main Dispatcher Administration which receives round-the-clock reports about radiation levels at all Soviet nuclear power stations, added: "There has been no deviations from the radiation regime, the more so accidents, at Soviet nuclear power stations ever since the Chernobyl tragedy in April 1986."

"Radiation monitoring services take water, air and topsoil samples at each station and 30 kilometers around it on a daily basis, and all of these have been well within the stringent radiation safety norms," he said.

"After the Chernobyl accident," he continued, "radiation monitoring has been stepped up considerably at all nuclear power stations and extra measures have been adopted to ensure their reliability and safety."

"This applies not only to the construction and use of reactors and nuclear power stations in general but also to their designs," he added.

"One is surprised in this connection at some biased stories in the Western press about the state of 'the Soviet nuclear power industry,'" Prudyshev said, pointing to recent reports about an alleged radioactive leak in the USSR.

"This is a pure invention," he said.

"I want to confirm that the USSR has strictly abided by the Vienna conventions of September 1986 on early notification of a nuclear accident and on assistance in the case of a nuclear accident or radiological emergency, which it itself has initiated," the Soviet official declared.

COMMITTEE WAGED STRUGGLE IN AFRO-ASIAN ORGANIZATION

LENSHIN: Moscow USSR in English USSR GNT 18 Apr 87

[Moscow] Moscow April 18 USSR -- The Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee at a plenary meeting held in Moscow today elected Professor Mikhail Kapites chairman of this public organization.

The meeting relieved Mirza Shagimov from this post at his request and thanked him for his long-standing work as chairman.

PRAVDA VIEWS DEBATE ON DRAFT ENTERPRISE LAW

PH011111 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 87 First Edition pp 1, 2

[A. Bikitin and V. Parfenov article: "Let Us Compare Opinions on the Draft USSR Law Expressed in Readers' Letters" -- first paragraph published in italics]

[Text] The time set for press discussion of the draft USSR Law on State Enterprises (Associations) has run out, but letters still pour in. During these 2 months PRAVDA alone has received about 4,000 letters containing a total of almost 10,000 suggestions and remarks on all 24 articles of the draft law.

Now that all letters have been read, there is full justification to say that the draft new USSR law, submitted by the party and the state for nationwide evaluation, has on the whole been greeted with approval. This is the main conclusion to be drawn from an analysis of the letters. PRAVDA's readers are unanimous that the sections and articles of the draft law have absorbed the most positive results of earlier economic experiments. The document's main virtue is the fact that it is imbued with the spirit of restructuring and of the transition to qualitatively new principles of organizing all economic, social, and political life, with the spirit of the incipient democratization of society and development of the people's socialist self-management. Therefore, readers note, the new law ought to become an effective legal instrument in solving the practical tasks set by the 27th CPSU Congress and the Central Committee January Plenum.

This document consolidates the principles of the state enterprise's activity as the basic production link. At the same time, the future law will create economic and legal conditions for the constant improvement of production management and development of the initiative and enterprise of all labor collective members.

A Law Dictated by Life [subhead]

In the course of the discussion of the document, and especially in the first few days, many letters raised the question: What necessitated the creation of yet another law? It is well known that the state enterprise's rights and obligations are now regulated by a statute adopted more than 20 years ago, in 1966. This period has seen major changes in the level of productive forces, in social life, and in the development of citizens' awareness.

Major measures based on complete financial autonomy and self-financing are being implemented to improve the forms and methods of economic management. According to data from the USSR Central Statistical Administration, in industry alone enterprises and associations employing 6 million people, in other words 16 percent of the total work force in the sector, have been working under these conditions from the beginning of 1987. They produce more than 20 percent of the total volume of marketable output. Of course, as far as these enterprises are concerned, many of the earlier provisions, recommendations, and instructions are now obsolete and act as a brake on the growth of production efficiency.

The objective conditions ripened long ago for working people to become genuine masters of their enterprises, and experience shows that this cannot be achieved through exclusively prescriptive and often bureaucratic methods of enterprise management from the center. A kind of reaction involving the rejection of old methods of economic management of enterprises' affairs developed back in the late seventies and early eighties, and preconditions for the development in every way of the democratization of management emerged.

It must be admitted that we were rather late in solving these problems. Many officials from central economic management organs and quite a few social scientists were thinking in terms of the distant past, terms which had developed way back in the period between the thirties and fifties, when it was unconditionally declared that the best method of managing production under socialism was rigid centralization, and that all types of output, from needles to mighty icebreakers, must be planned from above. This is unrealistic.

Henceforth, the new law on enterprises will make it possible to better combine the two inseparable aspects of democratic centralism: planned centralized management in solving the economy's strategic tasks, and the development of enterprise independence in solving tactical tasks. The new document is intended to provide answers to questions like: how is the socialist ownership to be further developed, what forms are to be used for the democratization of management, how commodity-money relations are to be organized under socialism, what planning functions are to be delegated from central to local level, and so on.

Where Quotas Fall Down [subhead]

It must be noted that the prospect of enterprises switching to financial autonomy and the principles of self-financing aroused keen interest among readers in the draft law's articles on the principles of planning and forming the enterprise's funds. Even though the draft document as a whole serves the goals of restructuring many readers believe that it is still vague in many respects. In particular, it does not refine effective methods for ruling out leveling in labor remuneration.

Economist A. Petrov cites a graphic example to prove this point. A small shoemaking workshop in one of Estonia's rayon centers employed four people. Even though the workshop had a monopoly, people worked badly: They worked on the side and sought to make unofficial earnings.

By way of an experiment, however, each shoemaker was assigned a mandatory monthly output plan, and over and above this he could work "for himself" without restriction. And what happened? Economic competition and a struggle for customers developed in the workshop. The result was a sharp improvement in the quality of service. Each shoemaker built up his own clientele. One of the four workers -- an idler and drunkard -- was forced to resign: Customers stopped giving work to him. This microexperiment is indicative and valuable because it encompasses the essence of economic competition for quality of service and quality of output.

Muscovite V. Kirsanov writes: "Some times ago a machine operator created an attachment enabling him to exceed the set target severalfold. At first he received a wage supplement for this, but later everything fell back into the same old rut. Does this mean that innovation had a negative effect on the wages fund? There was no incentive for other innovations. Creativity ended up in a financial impasse."

"The labor collective council," V. Kovalev from Stavropol Kray writes, "must be clearly aware and capable of sensibly explaining to all workers that when such-and-such work is performed we are legally entitled to such-and-such a material incentive. This requires that the law be intelligible and perfectly clear to every working person. The draft still contains many repetitions and vague appeals."

Great distance separates the foothills of the Caucasus from Komi ASSR. A sharp letter which came from there, written by engineer V. Ustinov, logically complements the previous one. [paragraph continues]

"I want to confess a sin: For days now three of us have been sitting down and pondering how to break or, to put it more mildly, evade the as yet unborn Law on State Enterprises. I think that some other leaders are also thinking hard about this. The tricky bit is how to conceal the 'snowdrop' -- the engineer who may be in excess of the quotas set from above for engineering and technical staff but is so badly needed in production. Generally speaking, when solving the question of granting independence to enterprises, we are still reverting to the notorious 'set from above.' Of course, some things must be set from above, but quotas on engineers are not one of them."

We think that there ought to be no question of a quota in the law on the makers of scientific and technical progress. Their number and composition ought to be determined only by the actual needs of production and by nothing else. Therefore readers suggest that Paragraph 4 in the draft law's Article 14 be either completely deleted or reformulated as follows: "The wages fund for leadership and engineering and technical personnel and employees is not subject to restrictions but is determined by the real needs of production."

The broadest response was evoked by the articles of the law covering the democratization of production management, and particularly the elections of leaders and the creation of labor collective councils. While approving the changes which were long overdue, readers point out the incompleteness of these new functions of labor collectives and a certain conventionality in defining the procedures of democratic institutions.

Economist P. Shvetsov from Gomel Oblast writes: "The draft law makes provisions for broad democratization in the enterprise management sphere and for extensive financial sanctions for poor work, right up to declaring an enterprise insolvent, which could cause a sharp reduction in the collective's wages. Under these circumstances, an elected leader is not always keen to take up the post to which he has been elected. He will have to shoulder considerable worries. Initially this must be compensated by a higher salary. I suggest that Paragraph 5 of Article 6 be extended to include the idea that the collective 'also sets personal pay supplements for any worker, including leaders, in recognition of good work.'"

Broader Step Toward Democracy [subhead]

The development of the principles of democratization is closely linked with the introduction of economic methods for managing the national economy. The draft law takes a significant step toward in this respect. This means that the newly elected director will be accountable not so much to "the top" -- along administrative lines -- as to the collective which elected him, and that the economic and social results of the collective's labor will be the best testament to the director. This is the main point.

At the same time, the election of leaders presents in a somewhat different light the problem of personal relations in production, between directors and workers, for example. It is evident that quite some time will be needed to overcome the psychological stereotypes in behavior on both sides, whose roots stretch back to the epoch of bureaucratic management. This goes a long way toward explaining in particular the opinion of the absolute majority of letterwriters, who lean toward the election of leaders by means of a preliminary competition and subsequent secret ballot.

"Otherwise," V. Kuvardin writes from Baku, "the entire democratization of management in industry will be stillborn. Under present circumstances, few people will dare to vote openly against their boss. Especially in small collectives, where everyone votes in front of everybody else. [paragraph continues]"

"After all, if the boss remains in office, he can settle scores with the 'opposition' so as not to run any risks at subsequent elections, and even to teach the others a lesson. Only secret ballots are the answer."

Nor can we overlook another frequently recurring thought. The press evidently idealizes the term labor collective. A collective does, after all, comprise all sorts of people. Including idlers, demagogues, absentees, and those who simply shirk work. A leader has to work with them all the time and to take measures which they naturally dislike. But now, in order to retain the "electorate's" votes, the director needs to be "softer." So what happens to enhanced demandingness and firmer discipline?

It will also be difficult to persuade a collective to elect as leader someone from another city or another plant. This may have an impact on the professional standards of production management. It must not be forgotten that we are talking not only about a good man and a good administrator, but also about a specialist who needs to be raised over the passage of time. "It was only after 10 years at work," A. Ivanov from Moscow writes, "that I personally managed to achieve results and scale the heights facing me. Knowing, however, that I may not be elected in 3 years' time, I would probably display less initiative and persistence and would try harder to be liked by the people."

Cost-Cutting in the Foreground [subhead]

Which general conclusions and main suggestions by our readers deserve particular attention during the final stages of work on the Law on Enterprise?

The most important suggestion could perhaps be formulated as follows. It is necessary to increase the new law's lifespan. For this purpose, it is necessary to develop those provisions which are needed not just today or tomorrow, but also in the longer term. At the same time, the fetters of obsolete instructions must be broken. The new law must cut across them like a mighty bulldozer. The law must reflect not so much what has been tested and tried out, as what still has to be gained and what must be sought when working out complete financial autonomy and the cost-cutting machinery.

Looked at from this viewpoint, the draft is still timid in opening up the horizons of tomorrow, and is vague in mapping out ways to create truly cost-cutting methods of economic management. Many of our readers are justified in remarking: The various drafters of the Law probably held opposite views -- some boldly rushed forward, while other strove to hang on to the old and familiar, even though it is now obsolete.

There are particularly numerous complaints about Article 14, dealing with the principles of wage organization. Many principles here have been left without any substantial change. Essentially, enterprises have not been given the right to set the wages of specific personnel without any restrictions within the limits of the wage fund. And since "ceilings" are preserved, there will still be ceilings on the display of creativeness and labor efficiency, and economic competition will not gather pace.

Another persistently recurring suggestion relates to the ban on revision of economic normatives. All readers are in favor of this. But at present, they note, many normatives are not scientifically substantiated and are just meaningless figures. And the bans of revision are largely rhetorical. They are not backed up by legal liability attaching to officials or organs who may violate these bans. [paragraph continues]

Without any legal guarantees envisaging a system of forms and types of liability for everyone who is obliged to observe and ensure the rights granted to enterprises, the new law will be as ineffective as the old Statute on Enterprises.

There are quite a few suggestions and remarks about Article 15, which covers material and technical supplies for enterprises. It is a most inadequately formulated article, because it still points toward "rationed" supplies of means of production to enterprises and the further buildup of stocks in warehouses, which means not a reduction but an increase in costs. The paragraph dealing with wholesale trade is formulated vaguely and timidly, and stretches its introduction over many 5-year plan periods. And yet the introduction of wholesale trade was discussed way back at the 23d CPSU Congress, in other words 20 years ago. And if the "improvement" of such an important article continues to be entrusted to the USSR Gosstat, which is not interested in letting go of even a fraction of its rights, any talk about wholesale trade will remain nothing but talk.

Readers sharply criticize Article 17, which regulates enterprises' relations with the budget. Readers advise that the following should be emphasized: The enterprise pays budget contributions according to norms fixed for the entire 5-year plan period and depending on the magnitude of the fixed capital, circulating capital, and labor and natural resources at the enterprise's disposal. This will force the collective to organize production so as to obtain the necessary end result while most rigorously saving all resources. What if their consumption rises without justification? The cost should be met from some of the financially autonomous revenue. This, readers point out, is one of the correct ways leading to a cost-cutting machinery of economic management. It is suggested in particular that financial resources be balanced against material resources and that the circulation of "surplus money" be prevented.

Many economists' letters about the transition to "cost-cutting" suggest that order be imposed in price formation. "It is time to abandon price 'designing' on the basis of expenditures," economist A. Solovyev writes from Kostroma. "The price must regain its primary purpose: To express cost, the quality of commodities, and the demand for them. Emulation of the best world standards in output quality will make it necessary to base prices on socially necessary expenditures."

Another way is to evaluate enterprises' work according to reductions in the prime cost of finished products. In this process, the incentives fund must be more closely linked to the level of reduction in prime cost. The part of the collective's economically accountable revenues which is formed as a result of falling prime costs must be brought to the fore.

The results of the discussion show that our economists and jurists will have quite a lot of work to do to create a genuine cost-cutting machinery of economic management.

The USSR Law on Enterprises will be finalized and adopted in the year of October's 70th anniversary. Looking back over the past, we can see an impressive panorama of what the Soviet people have achieved under the party's leadership. There is no time to stand and admire the achievements. Time is presenting us with a new challenge. Under changed conditions, our society is again undergoing a test of its dynamism and its ability to swiftly climb the ladder of progress.

And the greater the scope for creative work by people in their millions is, the clearer the goals are, the most effective the means are, and the clearer and the more reliable the incentives for labor are, the faster our country will march forward.

